THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 8. NOVEMBER, 1938. Vol. XXVIII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Modernism and the Episcopate.

Modern Churchmen are scattered throughout the world, but English Modernists are apt to judge of the progress of Modernism within the Anglican Communion by what is taking place in England. They think perhaps that their cause, judged by our English statistics, is not advancing as quickly as it ought to do. In this case, it is possible, in Canning's phrase, to call in the New World to redress the balance of the Old.

The October number of *The Chronicle* (New York), edited by Dr. Cummins, publishes the following item of news from the *Church Times* which was contributed by its American correspondent, Dr. Iddings Bell :

> 'This Liberal Evangelical Conference (he was referring to the June meeting held in New York City) announced with triumph that the last five Bishops of the American Church to be elected — Dr. Block of California, Dr. Dandridge of Tennessee, Dr. Brown of Southern Virginia, Dr. Peabody of Central New York, and Dr. Beverley Tucker of Ohio — are all avowed Modernists and members of their organized group. This is true. They might have added that all were elected by pressure of lay votes. The American House of Bishops is rapidly changing complexion in a Modernist direction, while the lower clergy are becoming more and more Catholic.'

Dr. Cummins makes the following comment on this statement:

> 'There's nothing, is there, like catching a quick (if amusing) glimpse of ourselves through someone else's eyes? But really, as for pressure of lay votes, we are a bit shocked at an Anglo-Catholic saying such a thing when we supposed that they, at least, still believed episcopal elections to be inspired by the choice of the Holy Spirit.'

In reference to the five new Modernist bishops, Dr. Cummins adds: 'We are inclined to think that their liberalism will stick to them through their episcopal years, and not, as has so often happened in the past, become a forgotten phase after assuming the episcopal habit.'

In these American happenings, we may see one more of many fulfilments of Clough's well-known lines:

> 'And not by eastern windows only,
> When daylight comes, comes in the light.
> In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly,
> But westward, look, the land is bright!'

Yet the situation in our own land is at least as promising from the Modernist point of view as it is in America. We have good reason to be thankful when we survey our English episcopate. This has been done in a series of three articles recently published in *The Spectator*. The writer of the articles notes in our English Church life that:

> 'The spread of Modernist Principles in theology has led to the emergence of Liberal Evangelicals and Liberal Catholics, by whom many of the characteristic tenets of old-fashioned High and Low Churchmen have been abandoned. There can hardly now, for example, be a bishop on the bench who would publicly confess himself a believer in the verbal inspiration of the Bible, and few (perhaps no more than one—and he shortly to retire) would accept the views upon Church history of the once universally authoritative Dr. Pusey and the early Tractarians. Moreover, since the episcopate generally represents the best intellectual standards of the clergy, it is the more likely to be sympathetically disposed towards Modernist methods. The acceptance of these methods does not, of course, imply the espousal of advanced opinions in matters of Biblical criticism, as the speeches of the bishops on the recent Report of the Doctrinal Commission illustrate. But whilst the majority of the episcopate can be counted on in such matters to come down on the traditional side, there is a much greater readiness amongst them to recognize the legitimacy of such a latitude of interpretation as the Doctrinal Report advocates than was the case a quarter of a century ago.'

A Prophesying Bishop.

Archbishop Benson, having told his son Hugh of the new boy who knelt down alone in the school dormitory and said his

prayers, asked: Can you imagine anything braver? To which the redoubtable Hugh replied: Six bishops in a dormitory and one of them who wouldn't say his prayers.

At the Church Congress the Bishop of Bristol would seem to have given an example of this kind of episcopal courage. Inspired by the prophetic spirit he condemned the Church's complacency in the face of vital tasks undone. He particularly emphasized the need for effective action by the Church in the spheres of Reunion of the Churches and the religious education of the nation. He maintained that the Church of England is simply concerned with its financial needs, the details of its own organization and the personal religious requirements of those who attend its services, and not with that larger aim for which the Church exists — the advancement of the Kingdom of God on earth.

Of course charges of this kind are bound to suffer by being too general and therefore as savouring of injustice in some cases. The Primate reproved the Bishop of Bristol for the lack of balance in his speech and maintained that proper attention to the details of the Church's institutional life was needful if the Church was to do its larger work effectively. This is no doubt true but it hardly met the Bishop's point that attention to these details was absorbing so much of the Church's interest and energy that the Church was achieving nothing effective in the fields where effective and immediate action is of vital necessity.

The Bishop urged the duty of securing convincing Christian teaching for the nation.

> 'It is generally agreed that so far as intelligent understanding of the Christian Faith is concerned the nation is semi-pagan. Yet the interest of most Church people in religious education is confined to the preservation of Church schools.'

The Bishop claimed that

> 'In view of the world situation Christian Reunion is a problem of quite vital importance, a matter of life or death. But it is one to which an overwhelming majority of Churchpeople, clerical and lay, are simply indifferent.'

There is, we feel, some injustice if the blame for this be laid at the door of the rank and file of Church people, whether clergy or laity. It is our bishops and other highly-placed officials who alone have the power to deal effectively with the situation. The

laity are practically helpless and the parochial clergy cannot take a lead without misunderstanding and in some cases even incurring rebuke.

The Rector of Chistlehurst in the *Times* of October 10th passionately asks :

> 'Who is great enough to-day to open the formal little doors that lock us into our separate denominational compartments and call us together in redemptive fellowship? Reunion has for so long been an ideal towards which we have worked with good hope and in patience, with all the spacious years ahead in which to achieve the ideal. The supreme question now is: Can those, whose hands hold the keys, be at last persuaded that the spacious future has simply disappeared.'

But they who hold the keys in the sphere of reunion are our bishops.

The *Times* remarks in a leader of November 2nd when dealing with the Primate's recent message to the nation signed also by the leaders of the Free Churches that

> 'Without unity among the denominations no revival of religion can influence the nation as a whole.'

Yet it is painful to realize that reunion among our English denominations is to-day further off than in 1920.

The Quality and Method of Reunion.

For a judicious and enlightened review of our practical problems as Churchmen we desire to commend to our readers the recent Visitation Charge of the Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich.[1] In it he treats the much vexed problem of Reunion. He writes :

> 'We sometimes hear the importance of unity so emphasized, the impotence of its absence so strongly urged upon us, that the inference would seem to be implied that nothing else was needed than the unity of the Christian Church to effect the remaking of the world. "That they all may be one, that the world may believe." It is germane to this idea to urge that the quality of the unity as well as the mere fact must be taken into account. History indeed has shown us an outwardly united Church and hardly a believing world, at all events a world no more like the Kingdom of God than the world to-day; and it may be urged that the external unity was not therefore a true expression of the facts. If so, and I have no doubt myself that it was so, it is evident that no simple unity of organisation, unity of administration or method, unity of confessed Creed, will of itself win the world, and it behoves us to look more closely for what it is that we are to

[1] Published by Harrison and Sons, The Ancient House, Ipswich. 1/-. 1938.

seek. What form is the unity to take which will mean the close co-operation of Christian people in meeting and overcoming the particular attacks with which our religion is confronted, and in bringing to a distracted world of strife and enmity the healing and the life which we believe can only come through the accepted Lordship and reign of our Lord Jesus Christ?' (p. 19).

The Bishop next calls attention to the teaching of the Report of the Doctrinal Commission on this question.

'The Commission's Report proceeds upon two main considerations, the one that the Church of England has kept its position and can only continue to retain it by its comprehensiveness, and the second the principle of development in theological thought and belief. It realises that it may not only properly comprise among its members those who belong to very different schools of thought, but that it may often be the case that the truth may be held with a good deal that is obscure, imperfect and perhaps erroneous, and that the clear light of truth is gradually to be won. Is this comprehensiveness a source of weakness in the Church or a source of strength? Whether it is the one or the other depends a good deal, as it seems to me, on the use we make of it. In themselves differences can hardly be a source of strength though they may be inevitable. They are inevitable because we have no complete body of truth, acceptable to all minds, about which we can be fully assured. It is only by the free play of thought and such knowledge as we have, the play of criticism, that the intellectual belief we hold can approximate more and more nearly to the truth and the truth itself can be more and more established. But inevitable as the differences may be they need not be a source of weakness unless we permit them to be. If we hold apart in our separate groups, if we are always in conflict with those with whom we are not in agreement, if we do nothing together in a spirit of fellowship, it can hardly fail to be the case that we become less effective than we might be and our differences be a cause of weakness. But if we determine to overcome this weakness by something that runs deeper than the differences themselves, the fact that we can manifest a unity in spite of them and actually through them, then they become a source of strength to us, "Strength is perfected in weakness." This is so in the Church of England. There our unity is not really the unity of a commonly accepted body of doctrines, for we interpret some of them differently and on some of them we profoundly disagree. It may be urged that these differences are not in the most vital matters that we hold. Fundamentally at least we are in accord on the great central truths, and the comprehensiveness of the Church recognises a large measure of diversity in those things that are not vital. But even here some things appear vital to some which to others are unimportant, and it is precisely this disagreement on points of doctrine, which now and then manifests itself and on which we feel so strongly, that brings the criticism that the Church has no common mind and makes us aware of a measure of dissension even when we are in the matter of outward order in agreement' (p. 20).

In view of all this the Bishop is convinced that 'a doctrinal basis' will not give us speedily the unity we seek. He is equally

convinced that this much-to-be-desired unity cannot be secured by unity of organization and order.

> 'Similarly with the question of Order. Here too the effects of modern knowledge and of literary and historical criticism have borne fruit and for many of us it is impossible to accept as authoritative and proceeding from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the Apostles acting on his instructions, the definite ordering of the ministry and organisation of the Church on Episcopal or on any other specific lines' (p. 20).

Hence the Bishop is driven to ask:

> 'But if neither the one nor the other, neither a doctrinal foundation nor a foundation of Order is likely to be effectual in bringing about the full unity of Christian people there is surely something else well worth our close attention which may in the long run achieve what we have so much at heart and which we believe to be in accordance with God's Will.'

He finds this source of unity in our Christian consciousness of the Divine Nature and Will: our common invocation of Divine strength and guidance: in our common endeavour to obey the Divine Will in our everyday life. This he finds to be very largely 'independent of particular forms of doctrine or of Church Order.' The Bishop asserts: 'The possession of this spirit does in itself contitute a unity of Christian people.' This spiritual unity, although advances have been made towards it, 'has not yet been sufficiently won.' This can be won by common prayer, acts of common worship and the cultivation of personal friendships and social relationships. The Bishop also advocates ecclesiastical co-operation:

> 'I have chiefly in mind two directions for the employment of our efforts, the one in the occasional practice of joining together in common acts of Christian worship and teaching both for ordained ministers and for the congregation. So long ago as 1920 the Lambeth Conference approved the practice of the occasional making and acceptance of the invitation to preach at one another's services. I am always glad to sanction proposals of this character in so far as they may be thought to need my sanction. Such acts of fellowship in our ministry appear to me to be of real value in promoting a sense of a unity of spirit in Christ's Church and to be a definite gain. I could wish they were rather more often resorted to. It is not often remembered that in the same way efforts of Evangelism in co-operation with Christians of other Communions were also advocated, and that I think must include the occasional presence at least of members of our congregations at the services of other denominations as of theirs at ours. I deplore the discouragement that such mutual acts—for they must be mutual to carry their due weight—have too often received in the past. I can hardly think of anything more calculated to stimu-

late an unfavourable attitude to proposals for re-union than the repression of such acts of mutual recognition in worship or of anything more likely to keep us apart.

'The other matter is more difficult, the practice of intercommunion, and I could heartily wish that the same sort of encouragement could have been given to the promotion of such intercommunion as has been given to the occasional mutual interchange in the ministry of preaching and in the ministry of congregational worship and witness. Some steps have indeed been taken when approval has been given to the admission in exceptional circumstances of members of other Communions to communion with us, but I could wish the approval had been wider and given with less hesitation. I cannot indeed give any general invitation in this direction, not because the Lambeth Conference carries any authority beyond that belonging to the expression of the opinions of the majority of its members, not because I think it contrary to the laws of the Church of England which again I am decidedly of the opinion that it is not; but because under existing circumstances approval of Acts of Corporate Intercommunion of this character must, I think, to achieve their purpose, depend on a more definite lead, possessing in the minds of Church People as a whole a measure of collective authority . . .

'When I was a parish priest I never hesitated to welcome as a guest at the Lord's Table anyone presenting himself although not belonging to the Church of England, and in so doing I not only followed the counsel of such Bishops as Bishops Westcott and Creighton and what was at one time a general custom in our Church, but believe that I was distinctly acting in accord with the Spirit of Him who said "He that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.' I could never do otherwise than approve such action' (p. 23).

It is because Church people generally are not ripe for the practice of inter-Communion that the Bishop hesitates to press it. Yet we believe that it is only a very small minority of Church people, although a very vocal and very influential minority, which would oppose it. The majority of practising Church people would approve it and also vast multitudes of Churchmen who for various reasons have ceased to attend the services of the Church.

The Ecumenical Movement at the Cross-roads.

It would seem that vast multitudes in Christian countries are finding less and less use for ecclesiastical dogmas. On the other hand, the authorities of the Christian churches seem indisposed to reduce their dogmatic demands. If Liberalism is a vanishing spirit in our modern civilization at the present time in the sphere of politics, it is not surprising that Liberalism should be a

weakening influence in the Christian Churches, which are apt to reflect more of the influence of the world on them than their influence on the world.

The authorities of the Christian Ecumenical Movements of Faith and Order, and Life and Work, by demanding as the basis and condition of membership the doctrinal confession of 'Jesus Christ as God and Saviour,' would seem to be evincing the spirit of our political reactionaries. Quite apart from dogmatic objections to this formula and the nice question as to whether those who have propounded it and seek to enforce it do not incur the Chalcedonian anathema, the practical objections to such a policy are very great. This was acutely felt at the recent Conference of Liberal Christians held at Bentveld in Holland, at which the following resolution was carried :

> 'This conference, held at Bentveld in Holland under the auspices of the International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom, and including representatives from twelve countries, rejoices at the progress made towards the formation of a World Council of Churches, but at the same time regrets that the basis and condition of membership put forward are of such a character that they must of necessity fail to include "all who profess and call themselves Christians," and who are working for the Kingdom of God in the name of Christ.
>
> 'This Conference expresses the earnest hope that the basis may be given serious reconsideration and made more comprehensive, so as to include within the World Council itself, and not merely as co-operators in the work of its commissions, the churches which cannot accept the basis as at present proposed.'

It is clear to-day that if we are to prescribe for acceptance a dogmatic formula as a necessary condition for membership in a Christian fellowship which seeks to unify the Christian world, it ought to be as comprehensive as possible. It ought to be so framed that while containing the essential Christian affirmation —God is our Father, and that through his Son, Jesus Christ, we have been brought into filial relations with Him and into fraternal relations with one another — it must be so simple as to lend itself to a very wide interpretation. Christian leaders and pastors, provided they are convinced that a man is facing in the right direction and is resolved to advance in that direction resolutely and experimentally, ought to be very careful to make no demand from him in the dogmatic sphere which he cannot conscientiously and whole-heartedly grant. People who are willing to make the

experiment in Christian discipleship, not necessarily those who are willing to affirm dogmas, is what the modern world needs to-day for its salvation.

Christ said: 'Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?' And it was St. Paul who wrote: 'If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His.' If it is to triumph, what the Ecumenical Movement needs as its basic possession is not the profession of a common dogma, but the possession of the Spirit of Christ. Will not the Ecumenical Movement seek to make its basic affirmation the acknowledgment of this truth?

English Unitarianism and its Future.

The Unitarians are officially treated like religious pariahs by the authorities of the orthodox churches. Yet when we read the writings of the great Unitarian teachers such as Martineau, James Drummond and Thom we find them to be expositions of Christian teaching of the most illuminating and inspiring quality. They possess a profundity, a spirituality and a catholicity which appeal to us as essentially Christian. Of course there are other Unitarian exponents of the Christian religion for whom no such claims can be made. A rationalistic, negative and narrow controversialist temper characterizes them: they are as dogmatic as some of their traditionalist opponents. The great Unitarian teachers have stood steadily for liberation from the tyranny of theological dogmas whether positive or negative: the lesser Unitarians have shewn themselves as liable to be enslaved by the dogmatic temper as the traditionalists they despise.

Unitarianism to-day is said to be a declining influence in English religion: the Modernists are charged with having stolen its thunder. This charge against Modernists is not entirely correct. Very few English Modernists have been directly influenced by Unitarian teaching: but many Modernists have been compelled, perhaps it will be thought rather late in the day, to voice the claims of dogmatic freedom for which Unitarians strove and suffered.

English Modernists are at one with the greater Unitarians in their conviction that dogmatic freedom is essential if the

Christian Church is to be an effective teacher of Christian truth. They are also one with the greater Unitarians in their conviction that truth alone is orthodox—a conviction voiced in 200 A.D. by the fiery Tertullian: 'Christ called himself the Truth; He did not call himself Tradition.'

Where Unitarians and Modernists differ is in their attitude towards the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation; accepted by the latter, rejected by the former. If the bitter controversies and cruel persecutions which have accentuated these dogmatic differences could be forgotten, and if the doctrines in dispute could be re-investigated with open mind and sympathetic understanding by both parties, we believe that a common agreement could be reached. There are values in both doctrines which are not only essentially Christian, but which must be retained if the Christian religion is to be effective. We are inclined to think that many Unitarians will agree with this statement. Unitarianism itself is becoming Modernist. An excellent example of this is seen in a most educative series of shilling books (twenty-two in number) published by the Lindsey Press. The series is entitled *Religion: Its Modern Needs and Problems*, and to it a number of Unitarian ministers contribute. The main features of the series, and some conclusions to be drawn from them, are summarized by Miss Irene Hubbard in an able essay, *The Present Religious Situation*.[1] If the situation presented by Miss Hubbard develops, and in our view it is bound to develop, then the more progressive elements in Unitarianism—and they, we are inclined to think, constitute its greater part—will find themselves increasingly attracted to what may best be described as a Liberal Catholicism—a Catholicism which has liberated itself from materialism, obscurantism, bigotry and tyranny, and which perceives the need for a comprehensive Christian Church characteristic of which is Unity in diversity, Freedom with order, Continuity with progress.

It may have been different in the past, but to-day at any rate Unitarianism, instead of remaining a sect, can better serve the interests of Christian truth and freedom, Christian re-interpretation and re-conquest, by entering the ranks of the English

[1] Published by the Lindsey Press. 1938. 1/-.

Church — if only the English Church can enlarge its mind and heart sufficiently to find a place in its membership and ministry for Modernist Unitarian Christians. To some this suggestion will seem absurd: to others treasonable. But these are the logical dogmatists who know nothing of those 'thoughts which do tenderly touch,' to cite a phrase of the author of the *Religio Medici*, for whom possibilities assumed the form of certainties.

If the tone and temper of Modern Unitarianism is really reflected in such utterances as the following—and we are inclined to think that it is—then possibilities can become certainties.

> 'Religious teaching, if it is to have any appeal to the modern mind, needs to be made both rational and poetic, but the two elements must be kept distinct. Men of to-day will respond to reason and they will respond to poetry, but they will not respond to an uneasy mixture of the two' (p. 42).
>
> 'Nevertheless, those who succeed in steering clear of the Scylla of obscurantism should be equally careful to avoid the Charybdis of an unimaginative rationalism. Like all religions, Christianity is supra-rational, but this is to be something quite other than irrational. It may well be that the essential nature of Christianity can only be expressed in the language of poetry and symbol. To many, although the great Catholic dogmas are frankly incredible regarded as statements of a scientific or historical fact, they nevertheless enshrine spiritual truths so deep and fundamental that to banish them from our Church services, or to preserve them merely as interesting relics of the superstitions of an unscientific age, would be, not only the height of folly, but an abandonment of the deepest truths the spirit of man has yet conceived. That which is superstition regarded as a scientific fact may be the very bread and wine of the spiritual life regarded as poetry and symbol. Some sacramental ritual and such doctrines as the Incarnation and the Atonement would seem to be examples of this' (p. 40 *f.*).[2]

The Forty Stripes save One.

Modernists are deeply concerned with doctrinal reform. It seems to them to be one of the pressing needs of the Church of England; something which, if it could be realized, would secure for the teaching of that Church a greater appeal to the modern mind. To possess a modern pulpit, with a modern presentation of Christian doctrine which is in conflict with the Church's doctrinal formularies as reiterated in her services, is a most disconcerting and disappointing, and even disastrous, situation.

[2] *The Present Religious Situation.* By Irene Hubbard.

Dean Matthews is a Modernist, and as such he desires doctrinal reform; and we are deeply grateful to him for voicing the pressing need for it in his eloquent address delivered to the Church Congress at Bristol. We cannot, however, feel that he is well-advised in demanding the revision of the Thirty-nine Articles. The revision of the Thirty-nine Articles seems to us to be the least pressing need in the sphere of doctrinal reform, and for the following reasons.

First, because the Thirty-nine Articles hardly come at all under the notice of the laity to-day. Most of them know nothing of them. They have never even read them through. They may perchance have heard them read at a very rapid rate at a Sunday Morning Service by an Incumbent after his institution and induction. In that case the performance has only attracted their attention as the survival of a curious archaism which has no more to do with them than the wearing of a mitre by their diocesan bishop. So far then as the laity are concerned—and they surely are the real and primary concern of the Church—the revision of the Thirty-nine Articles is superfluous.

Secondly, because to-day the Articles themselves have very little binding authority over the conscience of the individual clergyman. This is due to the form of clerical subscription to the Articles having been deliberately altered by Act of Parliament in the sixties of last century for the express purpose of removing conscientious scruples by permitting the greatest freedom of interpretation of the Articles themselves, and also by allowing the greatest relaxation of binding power in the case of the clergy required to subscribe them. John Henry Newman in Tract xc had shewn to catholically-minded clergy that the Articles were 'patient of a Catholic interpretation.' It was left to Benjamin Jowett, Dean Stanley, and other Liberal Church leaders to demonstrate in a most practical way that the Articles were also patient of a Liberal interpretation, and that all that the clergy were required to do was not, as before the passing of the Amended Subscription Act, to give 'unfeigned assent and consent' to all and each of the doctrines contained in the Thirty-nine Articles, but merely to assent to the general tenour of their teaching.

Thirdly, because any attempt to revise the Articles would lead to a prolonged and bitter fight between the Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics which must of necessity weaken the Church. It was a solution worthy of the great English lawyers who devised it that the consciences of the clergy should be relieved of their scruples, not by altering the text of the Articles, which would be a task of great difficulty, but by altering the form in which the subscription was made. This solution is an example of that 'wisdom' of which Creighton saw the greatest need in the councils and policy of the Church.

Fourthly, because the Articles as they now stand are historic documents of great value and express with uncompromising clearness, on a number of most important issues, where the Reformed Church of England stands in contrast to the Church of Rome. It is a matter of no little importance that the Reformed position of the Church of England should be clearly recognized to-day, especially in view of the persistent, and by no means unsuccessful, efforts made to Romanize it.

It is these reasons which lead us to feel that the time and trouble, which it would be necessary to spend in the revision of the Thirty-nine Articles desired by the Dean of St. Paul's, is emphatically not worth while. It seems to us that all English Modernists would do well to combine in pressing for three things in the sphere of doctrinal reform. (1) The authorization of a very simple statement of the Christian Faith to be used at Baptism. (2) The omission of the repetitions of the Apostles' Creed at Matins and Evensong. (3) The amendment of the Nicene Creed, used at the Eucharist, so as to bring it into closer agreement with the orginal form of that document by (*a*) substituting 'we believe' for 'I believe,' (*b*) omitting the Virgin Birth clause, (*c*) omitting the *Filioque* clause. As these emendations would do much to commend the Creed to a large number of Christian people, and would bring it closer to its original form, there can be no reasonable objection to them.

CLAUDE MONTEFIORE

By the Rev. Hubert Handley, M.A.

THE death of Claude Montefiore evoked in the public Press many high appreciations of his character and ability. *The Times* wrote that 'by his death Biblical scholarship, Liberal Judaism, philanthropy, and the cause of education have lost a distinguished, generous, and broad-minded exponent and advocate . . . Here was an Israelite indeed in whom there was no guile.' The *Jewish Chronicle* applied the verse: 'Know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel?' What I have the privilege to write here is of a more modest quality; it is an estimate by an ordinary Liberal Christian of a great Liberal Jew—to some extent, I venture to hope, atoning for its lack of authority by the ardour of its admiration and esteem. There is here no attempt to give a general or biographical view of Dr. Montefiore's career and achievement; there are merely some notes upon him in three of his chief fields of activity: (1) Liberal Judaism, (2) The London Society for the Study of Religion, (3) Friendship.

(1) Liberal Judaism.

What is Liberal Judaism? It is Modernism in the Jewish Church. We of the Modern Churchmen's Union ought to understand. The aims of Liberal Judaism are closely akin to our own. (*a*) As to Science, Dr. Montefiore writes: 'Liberal Judaism . . . has attempted to fashion a Judaism which can look Science in the face without flinching'; as to Criticism, 'When we are not hampered by having to accept everything in the Old Testament as good, or equally good, . . . when we recognize degrees we become so delightfully free.' And another leader in Liberal Judaism, the late Dr. Israel Abrahams of Cambridge, finely adjusts Jewish doctrine to critical advance (abbreviated): 'God never made a covenant with Abraham? There is an Eternal Covenant between God and Abraham's seed. Moses did not ascend Mount Sinai? In every age Israel reaches the foot and struggles up the slope. When the Higher Criticism has done its best, a Higher Truth emerges.' That is the intellectual or doc-

trinal note of Liberal Judaism. (*b*) Come now to the social or institutional note, the relation of Judaism to Christianity—akin among us to the relation of the Church of England to the Free Churches, in both cases the note being one of understanding and concord. 'Is it not wiser,' Dr. Montefiore asks, 'to push home our Liberal Jewish doctrine that all light has not shone through Jewish windows, even if one of the other windows be a Christian one?' There is here, on the Jewish side, an astonishing advance. Dr. Montefiore's almost classic edition of the Synoptic Gospels was a generous effort, even if, alas! largely unavailing, to close the old yawning chasm of antagonism, persecution, suffering, dislike, which separated Jews and Christians through the centuries. Here, for instance, is a passage from the Introduction to the Synoptics in which Dr. Montefiore finely appraises the 'new, inspired, prophetic' teaching of Jesus:

> 'The words "new, inspired, prophetic" are not rashly or falsely chosen. It is the spirit of the teaching, its unity, its fervour, its intensity, its enthusiasm, which were new, inspired, prophetic, rather than any one particular part of it. Pity, faith, love, trust—contemporary Rabbis spoke of all these things, but they did not, perhaps, speak of them with the same intensity and genius. They did not, perhaps, quite in the same way, demand All for the Highest. They did not preach the same impassioned doctrine of sacrifice. They did not show the same yearning to save the sinner from the fastnesses and the morasses of sin, or from the physical and mental evils which in those days were so closely associated with sin. It was in these more indefinable and subtler ways that the teaching was new, inspired, prophetic, rather than in any novelty of doctrine in any one definite particular.'

And on December 31, 1913, Dean Rashdall wrote: 'Dear Mr. Montefiore, . . . Your book, if I may say so, shows much more real appreciation of Jesus than the work of a good many professedly Christian—some of them fairly orthodox—theologians.'

But we must not be carried too far by this conciliation. Dr. Montefiore remains completely a Jew; he does not claim or wish to be in any distinctive sense a Christian. He writes:

> 'Though, in this doctrine or that, the New Testament may show a development over the Old Testament, the religious value or originality of the Old Testament on the whole may well be greater than that of the New Testament.'

Again:

> 'The New Testament does not, for the most part, contain what we, from the Liberal Jewish point of view, can regard as completely *new* doctrine which is *also true* doctrine.'

Once more, in his noble outlook for the future his religious anticipations are persistently Jewish :

> 'The supreme revelations of the Hebrew Bible constitute the core of our Judaism, the core of our religion, the core, as we believe, of the future religion of all mankind. We, too, can say of this book, as the Gentile proselytes are to say of Zion, "All my fountains are in thee."'

Liberal Churchmen deeply respect that utterance of Jewish idealism and hope. The more do we salute it the more we realize the affliction of the Jews to-day in Central Europe — the amazing, cruel hostility to this great, gifted, splendidly enduring people. Here, in the *Jewish Year*, a book shaped after Keble's model, is a just expression of their immemorial faith :

> 'Commit thy way unto the Lord, and trust
> In Him. Poor soul, midst doubts and fears astray,
> Dost thou in truth to Him, the wise and just,
> Commit thy way?
>
> Dost thou not rather vainly strive to sway
> To-morrow's fate, and at each stormy gust
> Of fortune sink in measureless dismay?
>
> Rest in the Lord, wait patiently, nor thrust
> Forth feeble hands in vain, but day by day
> To Him who lifts the needy from the dust
> Commit thy way!'

We have spoken with utmost respect of Jews. But we are Christians. What is the *differentia*? Jews are Jews; and Christians are Christians; what is the difference? Fourteen years ago I had the privilege of writing in the *Modern Churchman* (Dec. 1924) an article on Dr. Montefiore's book *The Old Testament and After*, and I there tried to answer that very question — to state the key distinction between Christian and Jew. Since that article was so fortunate as to earn Dr. Montefiore's approval and even his magnanimous thanks, I think that I cannot do better than, with the Editor's permission, briefly to repeat here its elucidations :

> 'Mr. Montefiore is a master of piety and goodness. He is at home among the monumental truths of religion which he affirms. He is a native of those sacred regions; he moves there easily and breathes familiar air. His book throughout is instinct with reverence and nobility, and who reads it becomes a wiser and a better man. As we close it, after intent perusal, we cherish towards the author a sentiment of profound respect and, if we may venture to say so, of affectionate admiration.

Shall we stop there? No. That would be to hide something; it would be to speak from behind a screen, not face to face. For consistency, therefore, not importance, we must here make a short personal confession of faith. For us, Judaism does not *satisfy*. No Theism, as such, satisfies. What does satisfy? Well, it was once proposed that beneath a large picture of the Crucifixion should be placed this motto —*Adequate*. That is the present writer's creed. He finds that it is the Cross, and the Cross only, which amid the riddle of things sufficiently unlocks the gates of Significance and sets free the fountains of Strength. And so, let the storms of life whirl; let the mystery deepen; let temptations hiss and drive and troubles break your back — still at the foot of the Cross, and there alone, the present writer finds *enough*. "*O Jesu, splendor aeternae gloriae, silentium meum loquitur tibi.*"'

(2) The London Society for the Study of Religion.

The L.S.S.R. was founded in 1904 by Mr. Joseph Wicksteed; Prebendary Lilley was the first President. Mr. T. Edmund Harvey and the Rev. H. B. Workman are among the very few other surviving original members. Among distinguished early members were Baron Fr. von Hügel, Professor Silvanus Thompson, Rev. Dr. Forsyth, Dr. Israel Abrahams, Rev. (later Canon) T. A. Lacey, G. M. (later Professor) Trevelyan. The object of the Society was, in a very comprehensive sense, the Study of Religion. Membership has been open to Christians of all schools of thought or association; to Jews; to Mohammedans; to Unattached (including Agnostics). There are no rules.

Claude Montefiore, an original member, was from the first a powerful and radiant influence among us. His learning and scholarship, his moral distinction, his sense of humour and personal charm adorned the Society. He was an early President and was Hon. Treasurer. He read papers on the following subjects: 'The Synoptic Gospels and the Jewish Consciousness'; 'Apocalyptic and Rabbinic'; 'Has Judaism any Future?' 'The Originality of Jesus'; 'Some Reflections about the Jews.' From the year 1922 the Society met generally at Dr. Montefiore's house, 42 Portman Square — during about the last ten years it met there almost always. This hospitality was a singular and invaluable benefit to the Society. It should, I venture to think, be noted. He first supplied simple refreshment; the members, say an average of twenty, then sat at the long table in his dining-room; he almost always chose for himself the lowest place, on the wrong side of the chairman, thus taking the

last turn in debate and speaking when a good many early leavers had departed. From first to last there was a silent assiduity for our comfort, and at the end a generous send-off, particularly to any member who was weak or ill — might the host send him home in a taxi? etc. And all the while the host had not the faintest idea that he was doing anything particular or was different from anyone else in the room.

On the occasion of Dr. Montefiore's eightieth birthday the Society presented to him a testimonial, and an address declaring :

> 'From its foundation you have been a mainstay of the Society. . . . Certainly but for you, Sir, it would neither have come into nor have remained in being. . . . You will look, we trust, beyond what we try to say to the admiration and affection we feel.' [1]

(3) Friendship.

Claude Montefiore as a friend is too large and sacred a subject for me to treat alone. A younger Jew, to whom Claude's friendship in all the world stood supreme, has been so good as to enrich this article with the following appreciation :

> 'He was for me the perfect friend. More than thirty years his junior, I nevertheless always felt completely at ease with him, though ever with a sense of awe and reverence, for I felt I was in the presence of a man who was very near to God.
>
> Whenever I needed him he was always there, never too busy to answer a letter by return of post or to see me when I wanted him. There was no problem in my life, whether in connection with my domestic affairs, my work, or my personal secrets which I could not place before him, and no detail was too trivial for him to heed. After probing deeply into every aspect of a subject, he would give me guidance with a wisdom that few men possess. His power of sympathy and of understanding was immense. When he rebuked me it was with such tenderness that, though he called me to repentance, he encouraged me with a new hope.
>
> If I came to him in anger over some event or person, he calmed me with a delicious sense of humour which made anger seem a folly. If days flew by and I neglected to communicate with him, a note would come from him reminding me of his constant love and thought.
>
> He was so unconsciously humble in all things—his great learning, his unbounded charity, his inspiring friendship—that it made his greatness seem even greater. Yet he found beauty and goodness in the simplest things and in the lowliest people.

[1] The particulars concerning the L.S.S.R. were kindly supplied by Mr. L. W. Comper, Hon. Sec.

> He was a delightfully entertaining companion. I never left him without being refreshed, strengthened, and guided. He never preached to me about God, but his wisdom and understanding, his tenderness and love, his justice and mercy revealed the attributes of the Divine Master, who sent him as His messenger, not only to the whole community of the House of Israel, but to the individual member of any community who was privileged to come his way. Through him I had a vision of God; through his life I have been shown how to serve God.'

Modern Churchmen will know how to value that intimate and moving memorial, and will be grateful to the writer for his confidence in entrusting it to our magazine.

I must add a few words on a humbler level. Those of us who had not the honour to be within the inner circle of Claude Montefiore's friends, but who were thankful to be even in the outer circle, to be anywhere so that his friends we were — we, too, want to say a few words of affection and gratitude.

The two marks of his friendship which most impressed me were its invariableness and its love. First, he was always the same. You could rely on him; he never disappointed you; he was unwaveringly, beautifully loyal. Secondly, though first in worth, the inner note and grace of his friendship was love. 'Always decide to use humble love. If you resolve on that once for all you may subdue the whole world'—so wrote Dostoïeffsky through a character in *The Brothers Karamazov*. I somehow fancy that Claude Montefiore heard the coming whisper of that sentence in his cradle, and shaped his life accordingly. Or, better still, Montefiore's friendship — allowing for that human weakness and taint before which Christian and Jew alike must bow the head in humility and penitence — seemed to illustrate St. Paul's immortal words:

> *'Love suffereth long and is kind; love envieth not; love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil. . . . Love never faileth.'*

THE NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS*

ARE THEY THE ALLIES OR ENEMIES OF CHRISTIANITY?

By the Rev. E. C. Dewick, M.A.,
Prin. of St. Andr. Coll. Gorakhpur, India.

THE Christian Message in a Non-Christian World, by Dr. Hendrik Kraemer, has aroused mixed feelings in Christian circles. Archbishop William Temple, in his Foreword to Dr. Kraemer's book, writes :

> 'This volume is likely to remain for many years to come the classical treatment of its theme — perhaps the central theme for Christian thought in this age of multiform bewilderment. It will bring new confidence to many who are perplexed, and supply the principles of missionary policy for our generation.'

Such a commendation should assure for Dr. Kraemer's book the careful consideration of the whole Church. And this the book well merits, for it presents us with a study of the basic principles and 'philosophy' of Foreign Missions which is certainly the most searching and stimulating that has appeared in our generation. In the past, the subject of Missions has generally been approached (even by those who would agree with Archbishop Temple that it is 'the central theme for Christian thought') more by way of appeal to the emotions, or to 'authority,' than by a reasoned consideration of the principles involved. (Perhaps that is one reason why so few of the younger Liberal or Modernist clergy seem to be led to offer themselves for service in the mission-field, compared with the larger numbers from decisively Anglo-Catholic or Fundamentalist schools of thought?)

Dr. Kraemer's book, however, is one which neither the intellectualist nor the practically-minded man can afford to ignore. It is written with a background of deep learning and wide experience. The author, who has been a missionary of the Dutch Reformed Church in Java, and a leader in the 'oecumenical' movement for co-operation among the Churches, is now Professor of the History of Religions in the University of Leiden;

* An examination of Dr. Hendrik Kraemer's *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World*. (Edinburgh House Press; 8*s*. 6*d*.)

and it was a wise choice on the part of the International Missionary Council to invite him to write this book, in preparation for the World Missionary Conference to be held at Tambaram, near Madras, in the coming winter. He has presented us with an immense array of solid facts, and also with an acute examination both of the facts themselves and of the principles involved. He begins with a brilliant analysis of the present situation in the world, and especially in the mission-field, for which alone the book is well worth reading. He then sets forth his conception of the doctrinal basis of the Christian Faith, and of the consequent attitude which Christians must adopt, on principle, towards the non-Christian religions. Next follows an appraisal of the various religious systems which exist in the modern world, and the special kind of missionary approach which is called for in each case. He concludes with a chapter on the nature of the Church, its relation to its environment, and its future development in the mission-field.

In many respects Dr. Kraemer's views have gone far ahead of the average missionary organizations of to-day; and he repeatedly urges the need for a radical re-thinking of missionary policy, in view of the far-reaching changes that have recently come over the world. Foremost among these changes he places *the virtual disappearance of 'Christendom'—i.e.* of the group of 'Christian' nations in the West which may be set in contrast with 'the non-Christian world' of Africa and the East. He points out that to-day, with the majority of the leading Western nations — Russia, Germany, Italy, France—either openly or practically non-Christian, it is simply an anachronism to speak of the West as 'Christendom,' or to regard the non-Western world alone as the field for the Church's missionary enterprise.

> To-day 'the Christian Church, religiously speaking, in the West as well as in the East, is standing in a pagan, non-Christian world, and has again to consider the whole world as its mission-field, not in the rhetorical but in the literal sense of the word' (p. 16).

If that is so, then a great deal of present-day missionary literature and planning will need drastic readjustment, if it is to be made relevant to the new world-situation.

Dr. Kraemer also sees clearly that the time has come to put aside resolutely the long-cherished belief that the European has a kind of inherent right for all time to dominate and direct the

affairs of the East. To-day, whether for good or for ill,

> 'the East rides again the horses of its own destiny. The Western hegemony in the affairs of the world belongs to the past. . . . Probably there is no fact more fraught with consequences for the shaping of the future of humanity than this' (p. 20).

Yet the Home Boards of Foreign Missionary Societies still continue, for the most part, to speak (and think) of Oriental converts as '*our* native Christians,' and regard any recognition of indigenous leadership within the Church as a matter, at best, for surprised gratification, and, at worst, for grave misgivings.

Dr. Kraemer considers that another serious weakness of missions has been their dependence upon the generosity of a small number of rich donors (p. 42), rather than upon the widespread support of the ordinary members of the Church. This has led in turn to an undue deference for the conservative scruples of the wealthy, and to a 'lack of imagination and flexibility of mind' which has been particularly noticeable in the attitude of missions as a whole to the demand for the use of indigenous methods of expressing the Christian message (pp. 314*f.*). He considers that the complaints of the younger Churches against the 'foreignness' of Christianity as taught by the missions are 'wholly justified' (p. 408); and urges that it ought to be not merely permissible, but obligatory, for the missionary to seek to present the Gospel as far as possible through the medium of native terminology and expression (pp. 308-326). For this purpose the missionary must seek to steep himself in the language, thought, and traditions of those to whom he is sent, so as to be able to approach them with real love and understanding, as fellow human-beings (p. 303). Dr. Kraemer's masterly and penetrating estimate of Islam (pp. 215-228, and 353-365) shews how largely he himself, as a missionary to Muslims, has followed out in this respect the principles which he here advocates.

These are but a few of the many valuable contributions made by Dr. Kraemer towards a right appraisal of the present missionary situation. But while welcoming these contributions cordially and unreservedly, the present writer finds it impossible wholly to endorse Archbishop Temple's hope that Dr. Kraemer's book 'will supply the principles of missionary policy for our generation.' For many of Dr. Kraemer's most important con-

clusions are deduced from a theological system which will certainly not be universally accepted, at any rate by Anglo-Saxon readers. That system is essentially 'Barthian'; for although Dr. Kraemer criticizes Karl Barth in some details, he shares to the full Barth's dualistic view of life as consisting essentially of the Great Antitheses between God and creation, Revelation and discovery, the Bible and human literature, the Church and the world, the Supernatural and the natural (pp. 25, 63-73). He regards all attempts to harmonize these antitheses within a larger Unity as a betrayal of the Gospel. He has an intense horror of all kinds of 'Relativism' and 'Immanentism,' maintaining that the domination of these over the modern mind is 'dreadful,' and has plunged the world into an 'abyss' of confused thought (p. 6).

Against all these he sets what he calls 'the radical religious realism of the Bible' (p. 83, etc.) as the only vehicle of God's saving revelation to man. Between this and all the rest of the history and thought of mankind he will not admit the existence of any essential or 'organic' relation. He believes that Barth is right in asserting the *discontinuity* of 'nature' and 'grace,' 'reason' and 'revelation' (p. 120). His own statements that 'the Christian Faith is indifferent to rational coherence' (p. 64), and that our human 'argument of value does not coincide in any way whatever with that of truth' (p. 106), implicitly reject the whole conception of an 'Inner Light' from God in the soul of man. Neither within us, in reason or conscience, nor outside us, in nature or in human history, will he allow us to look for any light to guide us to God. That light he would have us seek only in the Bible. And the Bible offers us, not a philosophy, nor even even a theology, but simply a 'tale' or revelation of God's free-will *acts* in Christ, which (just because they are free, personal acts) are not determined by any previous events or any 'law of causation' (pp. 70-72). The Christian Faith, then, is simply faith in these Divine acts—the Incarnation, the Atonement, etc. (p. 73), for which there has been no general *praeparatio evangelica* through human thought and history, except in the line of Biblical revelation (p. 123), and which are not the *consummation* or *fulfilment*, but the *crisis* (judgment) of all human thinking and experience (pp. 110, 287).

From this theological basis certain conclusions follow logic-

ally with regard to practical policy in the mission-field. If there is no 'organic relation' between the Revelation in Christ and the rest of human religious experience, it is obviously futile to attempt to find 'points of contact' between the Gospel of Christ and the non-Christian religious systems. 'Points of contact,' says Dr. Kraemer, 'can only be found by antithesis' (p. 139). He does not, indeed, advocate a *condemnation* of other religions; for condemnation implies *comparison*, and between two radically 'unlikes' no real comparison is possible. Besides which, the habit of making comparisons generates a self-complacency which is un-Christian (p. 108). Nevertheless, we notice that even Dr. Kraemer does not always abstain entirely from condemnation, as when he describes Islam as 'a superficial religion' (p. 216), or the effects of Hinduism in India as, 'on the whole, one of thraldom and bondage' (p. 234). In general, however, he does not call upon us to denounce the non-Christian religions as wholly false, nor even to regard them as entirely valueless according to human standards; but at the same time he will not allow us to see in them any real revelation of God, or to expect from them any contribution to the Way of Salvation. To suppose that by sharing our religious experience with the religious experiences of men of other faiths we can enrich our own spiritual resources is a delusion, and involves 'a denial of the revelational basis of Christianity' (p. 296).

Dr. Kraemer regards as completely mistaken the misgivings felt by Mr. Gandhi, and also by many modern missionaries, with regard to 'proselytism,' in the sense of an effort to persuade the convert to transfer his allegiance from one religious community to another. Proselytism, he says, is not to be apologized for, but 'belongs to the core of the missionary message' (p. 296). On the other hand, the modern tendency to regard 'the permeation of society with the Christian spirit' as one of the primary objects of missionary work is condemned as erroneous. Indeed, such permeation is in some respects to be deprecated, for it may actually 'stiffen the mind against further religious change' (p. 291). In any case, it does not fulfil 'the only valid motive and purpose of Missions,' which is

> 'to call men and peoples to confront themselves with God's acts of revelation and salvation for man and the world, as presented in Biblical realism' (p. 292).

From all this it is clear that if Dr. Kraemer's position is accepted as 'supplying the principles of missionary policy for our generation,' this will involve considerable changes in the direction of the policy that has been pursued of late. For during the last fifty years the general tendency of missionaries has certainly been towards a more sympathetic attitude towards the non-Christian religions, a greater readiness to recognize in them large elements of value and of truth, a growing emphasis on the importance of 'the peaceful penetration of ideas,' and, in some cases, even a willingness to join with non-Christians in common prayer to God, and a common search for truth in an atmosphere of prayer, believing that the result will be an enrichment of spiritual experience and understanding for all concerned.

If Dr. Kraemer is right, this movement must be renounced as fundamentally erroneous. He does not, indeed, ask us to go back to the attitude of the first missionaries and condemn the non-Christian religions as creations of the devil. Nor does he make any claim for perfection on behalf of any existing Church-system; indeed, he says that 'empirical Christianity' (*i.e.* Christianity as it is seen in history and experience) is 'just as much an example of religion in general as the other religions are' (p. 145), and therefore just as much open to criticism. But he does call upon the Church to concentrate upon one task only, that of pointing men to 'God's revelational acts in Christ,' and to regard all other spheres of knowledge and action as outside the distinctive message of the Gospel of Christ.

Now that is a very serious challenge to the Church, and one which calls for careful consideration. It can be substantiated only if the theological basis on which it rests is fully accepted. But some of us will certainly feel obliged to say that many of the theological statements which Dr. Kraemer seems to regard as 'self-evident truths' appear to us to be highly questionable, or at best dangerous half-truths. Some of the terms which he uses most frequently are never clearly defined in this book, and at times are used in such a way as to cover over a serious *petitio principii* and thus evade important issues. Take, for instance, his use of the term 'Biblical realism' to describe the extreme Dualism which characterizes his presentation of the Christian message. This use of the phrase implies that this standpoint,

and this only, is truly 'Biblical.' Now we agree that the predominant outlook of the Biblical writers *is* dualistic, and that they are generally content simply to present the Fact of God as a Person, without discussing the philosophical problems thereby involved. But there are also other lines of thought in the Bible —the mysticism of the Psalmists, the philosophical note in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel, and certain passages in St. Paul's Epistles (notably *Ephesians* and *Colossians*)—to which, as it seems to us, Dr. Kraemer does but scant justice, and which have a right to much fuller recognition, in any scheme which claims the title of 'Biblical realism.'

Dr. Kraemer is no less arbitrary in dealing with the various theological traditions in the Christian Church. He either ignores, or dismisses as sub-Christian, all thinkers who adopt a 'monistic' philosophy and seek to find God in a unity which comprises the world at large as well as the Christian revelation. He hardly mentions the long 'Platonic tradition' in Christian thought, which includes the Alexandrian Fathers, the main elements in the theology of the Orthodox Churches of the East, and English-speaking divines such as the Cambridge Platonists, the Cairds, Inge, Illingworth, Du Bose, Streeter, Cadoux, Garvie, all of whom in varying measure have advocated the larger view of God's revelation. Any thinkers of this type who are referred to are mentioned with disapproval. The theology of the early Apologists is 'not tolerable'; Origen is 'emotionally a Christian, intellectually more than half a pagan' (p. 327); the Roman Catholic recognition of 'natural theology' as a partial revelation of God is 'a failure and an error' (p. 115); Anglo-Saxon missionary literature in general is 'humanistic' (p. 339): the attempts of Christian thinkers and missionaries such as Troeltsch, Heiler, Appasamy, K. J. Saunders, or the American authors of *Re-thinking Missions* to find some bond of unity between Christianity and other religions, are deprecated as well-meant but mistaken (pp. 45, 109, 291, 370, 401, etc.). We submit that a theological system which thus sets aside large elements in the Biblical and Christian tradition has no exclusive claim to the title of 'Biblical realism'; for it is not fully Biblical, nor is it genuinely realistic, if realism means a resolute facing of all the facts.

Dr. Kraemer's denunciations of 'Relativism' also need to be supported by a more careful definition of the term. There is indeed an extreme Relativism which has become so vague and distrustful of all expressions of religious truth that it declines to give its allegiance to any, and contents itself with the ineffective platitude that 'one religion is as good (or as bad) as another'—which is certainly destructive both of clear thinking and of moral effort. But many—indeed, most—of those whom Dr. Kraemer condemns as 'relativists' are not of this type. They are men who believe that God exists as absolute Truth, Beauty, and Goodness, and that He has really 'spoken' to men through divers channels, the supreme Word being the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Him they do not put merely on a level with other prophets and revealers of God, but they give to Him their central loyalty, and acknowledge that it is through Him alone that they have clearly seen the glory of God's Love. They are ready 'to believe where they cannot prove,' and to act upon their belief.

Nevertheless, such men may be 'relativists' to this extent, that they recognize that even when a revealing Word comes forth from God in absolute perfection, it can only penetrate to us men through the medium of our human bodies, minds, and spirits; and since these are imperfect, our knowledge of the revelation is bound to be only relatively, and not absolutely, true. This does not deprive it of all religious value, as Dr. Kraemer implies by his denunciation of relativism as fatal to real religion (pp. 6-15). The attitude of 'Give me absolute certainty in religion, or I will accept nothing!' which is common alike to the Roman Catholic, the Fundamentalist, and the Barthian, seems to savour a little of the petulant traveller who, having realized that no map ever made by man is absolutely free from minute errors of measurement, declares that in future he will never trust or use any man-made map! Is the case of religion so different that we must insist that, in that sphere, nothing short of *absolute* certainty is of any value?

Now what is the ultimate foundation for Dr. Kraemer's demand that the Church must proclaim the Gospel as 'absolute' revealed truth, in contrast to all other relative knowledge? As examples of 'revealed truths,' he mentions 'the Sonship of

Christ, His Redeemership, His Godhead and Incarnation, the Trinity, the Doctrine of the Fall,' etc., which, he says, 'are expressions of the essential structure of reality,' and 'belong to the core of Biblical realism' (p. 333). He draws a sharp line between these and non-essential doctrines; for instance, he says that 'the presentation of Christ as the Second Person of the Godhead is an intellectualist obscuration of the Gospel' (p. 84). By what authority does he draw that line? He condemns the Fundamentalist view of the Bible as an infallible authority (p. 383 *f*); and still less does he admit the final authority of the Church in any of its historical forms (p. 145), or the validity of the appeal to the general religious experience of mankind (p. 294). What then is left, except *the conviction of Dr. Kraemer*, and others who share his theological point of view, that certain doctrines and events belong to the realm of the absolute and the perfect? He tells us that '*outside this revelational act of God* . . . Truth is a bigger thing than we can know' (p. 368) (italics mine); but this of itself implies that, within this act of God, Absolute Truth *is* within our grasp; and further, that we are able to draw a line between what is within, and what is without, the Revelation. But that surely is to claim for our human faculties a power that is more than human. And it is just because the affirmations of the Christian Absolutist (whether Catholic, Fundamentalist, or Barthian) always seem to involve that claim in the last resort, that the Relativist demurs that it belongs to the essential limitations of human nature that we should 'know in part, and prophesy in part.'

No less strongly would we question the *negative* aspect of Dr. Kraemer's thesis—that apart from Jesus Christ and the Biblical tradition, there has been no real Revelation or true Word spoken from God to man. There are no doubt Biblical texts, and passages from doctors of the Church, which support this view, but it cannot claim a monopoly of Christian authority. It does not readily accord with the general large-heartedness of our Lord, or of St. Paul and St. John. It is quite alien to the long succession of Christian teachers who, following Justin Martyr, have rejoiced to welcome non-Christians such as Plato as men who 'spoke well, according to the proportion of the Word sown in their hearts' (2nd *Apology*, xiii). As a protest

against sentimental vagueness in religion, it may be useful; but not as a statement of Absolute Truth. It would be a matter for regret if the recent revival of 'absolutist' claims by Christian leaders such as Dr. Kraemer should lead to the abandonment or condemnation of those experiments in inter-religious co-operation, worship, and mutual understanding which have been made in recent years in many parts of the mission-field. In this, as well as in other respects, our hope is that Dr. Kraemer's book will be received with circumspection as well as with appreciation, and that the changes in missionary principle and policy which he advocates will not be adopted hastily or unreservedly.

The value of the book will be increased if in future editions the author would attach footnotes to his many and interesting quotations, so that the reader may be able to refer to these in their context, instead of being obliged simply to accept them, as they are now given, *ex cathedra*, by the author.

Time alone will shew whether Dr. Kraemer's views will commend themselves to the Church at large or not. But be that as it may, his book assuredly merits the careful study of all who have at heart the cause of the Kingdom of Christ. We believe that the majority of those who read it (whether they accept its main conclusions or not) will agree that it is a great book, and a timely book, and one for which the author deserves the gratitude of the whole Church of Christ.

THE FREE AND OPEN SUNDAY

THE BOURNVILLE EXPERIMENT

By the Rev. G. E. N. Molesworth, M.A.

THERE must be many clergymen like myself who have been perplexed about their Sunday schools. In the course of time we realize that things are not what they were—numbers dwindle alarmingly, more and more children are taken out by their parents on Sunday afternoons — teachers come and go — and there is the ever-increasing leakage of young communicants and Sunday school scholars away from the church in the early teens. And so things go from bad to worse, and we all start blaming each other. This has at least been my difficulty, and I

have been asked to relate quite simply how I have dealt with the situation and with what results.

In the first place, I refused to believe that the individuals concerned were so much to blame as the 'system.' I enquired whether its 'psychology' was sound.

1. If children go to school on a Sunday afternoon till they are 14 or 18, they get thoroughly accustomed to the habit, and when the time comes for them to play their part in the big church they find no services at that hour, nor of the character to which they have been accustomed. Everything is strange, so their anchorage to the church gives way and they are lost.

2. Sunday schools attach the child usually more to a hall or a school: but the centre of the child's religious life should be the church. Nothing will take the place of the church through life as the child's second home.

3. We are all taught now that Sunday should be spent differently from the week-days. 'The philosopher will dig in his garden on a Sunday, and the gardener will philosophize.' Now the main occupation of the child during the week is 'school.' One would have thought that on Sunday their minds might well be directed towards worship.

4. Essentially Sunday is the day of our Lord's Resurrection —the day *par excellence* of worship and re-creation, *i.e.* the building up of spent energies. God first, re-creation second, and God last.

Thus far, then, we seem to have arrived at a few simple principles in building up a profitable and relevant Sunday observance. Children should worship in their Father's home, using the same hours (because habit proves so strong in human life) and the same kind of service as they may expect all their lives. Psychologically, children need to be interested, and they are never fulfilling themselves so profitably as when they have something to do and something to see.

So two years ago in Bournville we all stopped blaming each other and started again *de novo*. Our return home from our holidays was the zero hour. The Vicar had killed the Sunday school: the basis of the next step should be that of a family rather than an organization, and upon that everything has been built. I explained that I wanted to start a new church on exactly

the same lines as the big church. Everything in the big church would have its little replica among the children. I wanted an electoral roll of children, churchwardens, sidesmen, verger, council, and so on. I explained that whatever we did would be in church—it was their home—and it must also be held in the morning, as it was the duty of Church people to worship early on a Sunday morning; that Sunday should be a happy day for them, and having attended to their church duties there was no objection to their going out with their parents in the afternoon.

The electoral roll was open for all from seven to fifteen years. (Actually it has worked out that children start attending the services at four, and it is quite impossible to get rid of them at fifteen!) On the first Sunday, at 10, we held our little service. It was a 'glorified' Mattins—nothing in the service that is not in Mattins—and it lasted thirty-five minutes. It was *their* service, and they were in charge. Of course there are no registers —a vicar who is a friend soon knows who is absent—and they sit where they like and there is no one to keep order. It has never been necessary to question their behaviour.

We then formed a little choir. As we have a strong boys' choir in the big church, I thought it had better be a girls' choir. So we designed robes for them. They must at least be colourful, and eventually we produced a bright green beret, with a blue skirt cassock, a surplice and an amice. This made a distinctive costume, but unfortunately the green beret nearly sank my embryo junior church. The junior church council voted for veils, though why they should be like ghosts or brides was not apparent. Unfortunately someone associated the green berets with jazz, and I nearly had the whole of the senior council, as well as the junior, about my ears!

However, we raised enough money to buy two outfits, and so the little procession came in—two robed girls and the Vicar. It was their own. Then a little light oak Processional Cross was given to them, and so we appointed a server to carry it and dressed him in a green cassock and cotta. Here was the beginning of the Servers' Guild. Now, two years later, we have over two hundred children on our lists, a robed choir of twenty girls, a servers' guild of eight boys (with the greatest possible competition to be admitted to it), and a succession of boys and

girls who are keen Confirmation candidates and, best of all, who are growing into manhood and womanhood loving their church as their home.

Financially the experiment has been illuminating. We started with nothing, no money and no property, and we have never raised any funds by any kind of appeal. The Senior Council at first opposed the scheme because they feared it would be a too expensive luxury! I promised, however, that my junior church should be an asset rather than a liability; and with a 'boy' treasurer, and an 'auditor' who is the grown-up representative of the Senior Church Council appointed to supervise their interests, we have raised enough money to buy all our equipment and to increase the quota which we make to the Senior Church Council for our use of the church.

As regards their training for the Holy Communion: how many young communicants fall away from Communion because they have not caught the atmosphere of the service in their upbringing. So we have reversed the old precept, and now, on the first Sunday of every month, the children come and they bring their fathers and mothers with them.

The same difficulties outlined here have arisen with a Young People's Bible Class—a very desultory thing which has been abandoned. I asked them to come on Sunday evening to church, and they replied, 'We can't, because we can't find our way about the Prayer-book.' Probably it was true, but it would have been even more true if they had said they went to Sunday cinemas in the evening. So we closed the Bible Class and called them to our Church Hall at 6.15 on Sunday evenings. For ten minutes we discuss the affairs of the week and of our clubs, and then all go into church as a body. The growth of church discipline and loyalty has been startling. They enjoy the freedom of Sunday afternoons, and the trust and confidence they know I place in them has been more than reciprocated towards their church and towards me.

In summer, once a month, they come to the Sung Family Communion at 10—with their rambling gear—and then away into the country, until we all forgather ten or twelve miles away for tea in a country hall, or a tithe barn. The Vicar of the country parish always welcomes us, and his tiny church filled

with the young life from the city is an inspiring moment for many of us. The essential element behind the movement is trust, equality and partnership. We are not dragooning them, nor 'keeping an eye on them'; but trying to serve our Lord and to help them to serve Him each in our own way, with an equality of purpose. It is a free and open Sunday which bears upon it all the marks of Easter, and under its influence our children and young people have brought with them a new life to our church, and a mixing of the social classes in a way that does not usually come with the old Sunday School system; each year an increasing number of fathers and mothers have offered themselves for Confirmation with their children, and so whole families have been won for our Lord.

IN MEMORIAM: SAMUEL McCOMB, 1864—1938

The Modern Churchmen's Union has lost an old and valued member by the death of Dr. Samuel McComb, Rector of the American Episcopal Church in Nice.

Samuel McComb was a man of large body, large mind, and large heart. He was of the same race as the acutest of mediaeval theologians, Johannes Scotus Erigena: he was an Irish-Scot. The first stage of his education was accomplished in the north of Ireland; next at Oxford, where he had the great advantage of being tutored by Dr. Headlam; then in Berlin, in the golden days of Professor Adolf von Harnack and the great liberal historical period of theological studies. Later he became a Professor of Pastoral Theology in the Cambridge Theological Seminary in Harvard University. At this time he was closely associated with Dr. Worcester, of Emmanuel Church, Boston, and the notable Emmanuel Movement, which sought by the judicious use of religious psychology to improve the health and happiness of many whom ordinary medical methods had failed to relieve. Besides 'spiritual healing' Dr. McComb's main religious interests were preaching, prayer, and immortality. Himself an impressive preacher, he made a thorough study of the art, and his instruction in this sphere was of much value to those entering the ministry of the Church. He studied the art of prayer in the same modern manner and produced a valuable treatise: 'Prayer. Its Meaning, Reality, and Power.' He also published a helpful manual, *A Book of Prayers,* suitable for private and public use. His last effort in this direction was his translation into English of Heiler's enormous volume, *Das Gebet.* Other characteristic volumes from Dr. McComb's pen were *The Future Life in the Light of Modern Enquiry, Religion and Medicine* (in conjunction with Dr. Worcester), and *Christianity and the*

Modern Mind. Our readers will remember an inspiring paper on 'The Church as a Divine Fellowship' read by him at the Modern Churchmen's Conference held at Girton in 1933. In the April—May number of the *Modern Churchman* in 1936 Dr. McComb treated the Problem of Suffering. In our pages in December 1933 he dealt severely with Bartianism, and agreed with Harnack's description of it as 'A Desperado Theology.'

In his life a very sincere and simple Christian, Samuel McComb was thoroughly alive to the need for the modern approach to religion and the modern presentation of it to the modern world. He had a genial, pleasant disposition, and was given to hospitality, in which he was greatly helped by his noble and beautiful wife. In 1925 I spent many pleasant days in his American home, in which family prayers constituted an unforgettable experience.

His former colleague, Dr. Worcester, Rector Emeritus of Emmanuel Church, Boston, U.S.A., writes of him:

> 'I have always believed that it was God who sent Dr. McComb to me, as a perfect stranger, when I needed him most. In him I found a congenial and richly-stored mind, a loyal heart, a merriment and wit which made life a pleasure. . . . His ready wit and drollery were delightful to me, and, far more important than either, I soon discerned in Dr. McComb a natural piety, a true sense of the Divine and the Holy which I have always considered his greatest gift, a real spiritual endowment. Pre-eminently he was a man of faith and of prayer.
>
> 'While Dr. McComb was in Boston, he touched its religious and social life at many points. Many of his sermons were notable and, to this day, are well remembered by those who heard them. As a witty extempore speaker he had few equals and he was at all times a dangerous controversialist. Far more important are the personal services he rendered freely to all who came to him, from the foremost citizens of this Commonwealth to the humblest and most miserable. His reasoned faith in Immortality added to the sum of human belief. With all the rich resources of his mind, his greatest gift to us was the gift of his tender, heartfelt and refreshing prayers. How many men and women pray to-day because Dr. McComb taught them to pray.'
>
> H.D.A.M.

BOOK REVIEWS

A MONUMENT OF PIETY*

The late Rev. E. I. Fripp probably had a more intimate knowledge of sixteenth century Stratford and Warwickshire than anyone in England. A Life Trustee of Shakespeare's Birthplace he spent the whole leisure of a busy ministerial life in exploring contemporary records and clearing up the background, social, intellectual, cultural, political and religious, against which William Shakespeare moved. Too much Shakespeare study appears

* *Shakespeare, Man and Artist*. By Edgar I. Fripp. (Oxford University Press. 2 vols. 38/-.)

to have approached the dramatist from the side of Restoration gossip, when the Stage was degenerate and discredited (Ben Jonson left it in disgust), Puritanism exhausted, and England at its moral and spiritual nadir. But Mr. Fripp surveyed his subject not through the smirched glasses of the latter end of the seventeenth century, but through a detailed and exhaustive study of sixteenth century Stratford. He approached the Poet:

> 'on the side of Latimer's Warwickshire and the Reformation in Stratford; the old Morality Drama still going strong, hand in hand with the preaching of "God's Word," and the reading for the first time in English of the Bible as a new and sacred discovery.'

It was a time of transition, and the new order of things initiated by the Reformation had not yet produced its full consequences in the depression of some classes and the enrichment of others. The England of Shakespeare's boyhood was still semi-feudal:

> 'The Warwickshire "folk," of whom we get glimpses in the records, were not hewers of wood and drawers of water, obsequious or sullen, without hope and therefore without frankness or delight, but men and women of spirit; and their "betters," because they were not a mere ornamental, parasitic class, but were called upon perpetually to render for their privileges hard, responsible service to the Crown, had joy and character. Decay indeed in both—in the economic condition of the worker and the ethical status of the "gentle"—had followed the pillage of the monasteries. A greater iniquity or folly was perhaps never perpetrated in English statesmanship than the dispersal of this splendid national inheritance into private hands. Rents were immediately raised, the farmer and labourer depressed, and the "owners" degraded from the "honourable" and the "worshipful" to the mercenary.'

But one thing distinguished the sixteenth century in England; it was still a religious age:

> 'One fact lifts the Warwickshire man of Shakepeare's youth, rich and poor, above the commonplace. He had religion. Whatever superstition or bigotry mingled with his faith—pagan error, bad history, poor science, savage sectarianism—he believed in Providence and Grace. His faith, as he deemed it, was the Truth, greater than himself and demanding his loyalty. And that he was willing to suffer for this, and, Catholic or Protestant, he *was* willing, raised him at a bound into the realms of imagination.'

The Reformation had taken deep root in the Shakespeare country. Ralph Collingwood, afterwards Dean of Lichfield, the friend of Colet and Erasmus, was Warden of Stratford College from 1503 to 1507. Both Tyndale and Latimer were in the neighbourhood, the former beginning his translation of the New Testament at Little Sodbury in Gloucestershire in 1523. The district suffered heavily under Mary's counter-reformation, and even Elizabeth's *via media* lay too close to Catholicism for many sturdy Stratfordians, including the Poet's father, John Shakespeare, whom Mr. Fripp demonstrates to have been a Puritan recusant. The fact was that

Elizabeth, whose first and final object was domestic peace, went to great lengths (since she was assured of the loyalty of the Protestants) to propitiate the Catholics. And very gradually her policy of compromise and outward conformity did prevail, and England thereby was saved much suffering, and would have been saved yet more had subsequent male rulers had her good sense and courage. The ecclesiastical latitude which lasted from 1558 until 1571, when the Northern Rebellion forced the hands of the authorities, and the Pope's Bull of Excommunication drove Catholics into unwished-for recusancy, was a remarkable and purely English phenomenon: it was not legal, but it was real. Mr. Fripp says of it:

> 'The Act of Uniformity was largely inoperative, and the Act of Supremacy was sparingly tendered. Liberties were taken with the Prayer Book, omissions and personal utterances were winked at. The clergy exercised a freedom they have not enjoyed since. Certain of them celebrated mass openly to the indignation of fervent Protestants. Englishmen practically were in one church. And this period of comprehension, a most interesting and fruitful epoch in the history of our national communion, would have continued longer (but for the causes above indicated).'

But from latitude the Church passed slowly to uniformity and rigidity which made dissent inevitable. All this can be traced in detail in the local records of the Shakespeare country. It is very interesting that Mr. Fripp, whose own ministry was not in the Church of England, should have understood the particular genius of that unique institution for better than ninety per cent. of Anglican clergymen. He understood the Elizabethan Settlement, and the motives which lay behind it.

According to Mr. Fripp, who establishes his point with abundant evidence, the two books which stand out pre-eminently for their influence upon Shakespeare were the Bible and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Holinshed's *Chronicles,* Plutarch's *Lives,* Montaigne's *Essays,* all had their place, but those two came first. And Mr. Fripp establishes beyond doubt that it was the *Metamorphoses* in the original Latin that Shakespeare was familiar with; for that he was a man 'of little Latin' is one of the libels against our national Poet that he disposes of completely.

Shakespeare's debt to the Bible has been underestimated by scholars, since few students of the poet have also been close students of the Bible; Mr. Fripp has the advantage of them there.

> 'If the Bible were lost, the tragedy of Cain (the story is referred to twenty-five times in the poet's writings) could be reconstructed out of Shakespeare. So, largely, could the stories of Jephtha, Samson, Job, Herod, Judas, Pilate, the Prodigal Son, Dives and Lazarus. Probably Francis Bacon alone among contemporary laymen knew his Bible so well. And to the Poet it was a book of *lives*—of men and women and their experience, their happiness or misery, their speech, the scenery they moved over, the foreground and background, ethical and metaphysical, of their existence.'

These two volumes of Mr. Fripp's are a storehouse of curious and exact information which can be opened anywhere in the certainty that something interesting and even arresting will be found to delight the reader. The erudition is vast; indeed these volumes do represent a life's work, and one which was clearly a labour of love. The author's zest for his subject stands out everywhere. The reader feels as if he were being happily and courteously guided through sixteenth century Stratford and Warwickshire by some kindly townsman of that day, and introduced to its inhabitants, its buildings, its customs and its daily life, by one who not only knew the place, but loved it from the bottom of his heart. It is a matter for congratulation that it was found possible to give to the world, after the author's death, these fruits of years of research and study. The Oxford Press has produced the two volumes in a style worthy of itself, the subject and the author, and the illustrations, many of them reproduced from photographs by Mr. Paul Fripp, the author's son, are a very pleasing feature of the work.

J. C. Hardwick.

CHRISTIANITY AND POLITICS*

Mr. Kenneth Ingram's *The Christian Challenge to Christians* and Canon Lloyd's *Revolutionary Religion* deal with the relationship of Christianity to the Totalitarian creeds. They are well written and deserve to be carefully read. They have a good deal in common. Both regard Totalitarianism as a Religion and show (though from different standpoints) that it is the most formidable opponent that Christianity has had. Both agree that Christianity is the natural enemy of Fascism, though, while Canon Lloyd finds in this an argument against Communism, Mr. Ingram uses it to show that Communism and Christianity have the same platform. They both criticise the fumbling methods of democracy, but while Canon Lloyd counsels patience, Mr. Ingram would urge political action.

Canon Lloyd gives a good survey of Totalitarianism in practice. He finds that the dominant Materialism on which Communism is based impersonalises man and cuts at the roots of morality. By substituting the Historical Process for God, it stresses a theory of inevitability which takes the place of morals.

> 'The Communist knows that in the end, his best argument against Capitalism is not so much that it is wicked as that it is inevitably bound to fall. It has already been doomed by the Historical Process, against the verdict of which there cannot be an appeal' (Lloyd, p. 70).

The Fascist philosophy, on the other hand, does not worry about the nature of matter or the sphere of morals. It regards individuals as units

* *The Christian Challenge to Christians.* By Kenneth Ingram. (Allen and Unwin. 224 pp. 1938. 6/-.)
Revolutionary Religion. By Roger Lloyd. (S.C.M. 192 pp. 1938. 5/-.)

rather than as integers: they exist for the State and not vice versa. This results in a Universalism which

> 'does not content itself with making the individual wholly dependent upon, and giving a blind obedience to, the community. It leaves room for the continued existence of the individual only in so far as he is so conditioned and trained as to make the needs of the community his own being, so that he becomes an automatic register of those needs and decisions' (Lloyd, p. 80).

Mr. Ingram also has something to say about underlying theories, but it is interesting to compare the tactics of the two writers. While Canon Lloyd makes history his court of appeal, Mr. Ingram is concerned to prove the excellence of a theory and so he brushes aside all illustrations drawn from contemporary politics as being inevitable but transitory. Thus, he holds up for admiration the Communist ideal of the class-less society as being the only Christian objective. Canon Lloyd agrees, but, after pages of illustrations, concludes, 'Whatever may or may not have been achieved in Russia, classlessness is certainly not one of its achievements' (p. 111). For Mr. Ingram, one great delight of the Communist ideal is that it solves the question of colonial possessions:

> 'Imperial possessions *would become* an anachronism, since capital would no longer seek an outlet for investment for profit.'†

But, says, Canon Lloyd, again with a wealth of illustration,

> 'The U.S.S.R. is at least as imperialistically-minded as any Fascist power is' (Lloyd, p. 113).

This battle of theory and practice is a familiar one and it may well be that in the end, theory is the more important. But where, in the meantime, is the Christian to throw his weight? Mr. Ingram would have us believe that we *must* move Right or Left and that the Christian choice must be Left. Canon Lloyd insists that both Right and Left are wrong and that there is a more excellent way.

Here, Mr. Ingram has all the advantage of lucidity of argument and clear-cut statement. His theme is that Capitalism, however necessary a stage in progress, is now played out, since it depends on ever-expanding markets and upon the private ownership of the sources of wealth. But as investment has now reached saturation point, unplanned Capitalism must now mean chaos.

> 'It must substitute planned economy for the present absence of plan, and planning means either Socialism or Fascism' (p. 45).

In this movement, Christianity is inevitably involved since it must either assert its cardinal tenets or perish with Capitalism. In any case, Mr. Ingram believes that Capitalism has already proved to be the negation of Christianity since it has been responsible for the subservience of the working class as well as for the present evils of class-warfare and of unemployment. Hence

† Ingram, p. 25. Note the tense: *would* or *could* is used fifteen times on this page.

his remedy is a Christianity which has been riddled of the dualism of thought which has allowed this, and has become revitalised—with Communism.

With most of Mr. Ingram's criticisms of the authoritarian presentation of Christianity, Modernists will be in whole-hearted agreement—though they will be surprised to find an Anglo-Catholic voicing them. But when he goes on to show the bearing of this theological outlook upon his political creed, he will outpace most of us. For, rejecting any such 'middle way' as Canon Lloyd would offer, which would counsel Christianity to reform abuses by applying itself more diligently to changing men's hearts and appealing to their spiritual nature, Mr. Ingram stands uncompromisingly for the conviction that the Kingdom of Heaven requires political action. The private ownership of wealth-production is an obstacle to the Kingdom: hence: 'to break down this obstacle is inevitably the present objective' and 'this cannot be achieved apart from political action' (p. 144).

Having thus identified Christianity with Socialism, Mr. Ingram proceeds by a careful choice of texts, to show that this actually was Christ's teaching. 'It is not enough,' he writes,

> 'that the rich man should administer his riches equitably. The fault lies in the fact that he possesses riches which compel him to perpetuate class inequality. Yet Christ was uncompromising on this point. There is no suggestion in the parable of Lazarus that the rich man was wicked or the beggar righteous. . . .'

Hence, Mr. Ingram's conclusion is that

> 'An owner who possesses wealth on a scale which involves the employment of human labour is denying the essential conditions of the Kingdom of Heaven' (p. 147).

This would seem to imply that every parson who employs a housemaid is debarred from the Kingdom of Heaven: the only solution would be to marry the girl!

Yet it is noticeable that while Mr. Ingram castigates those who water down Christ's teaching on riches, he is not prepared to adopt the same literal interpretation of other equally genuine sayings. For example, he would identify Christianity with a creed which ultimately is based on force. He will have the Church definite and uncompromising, ready to win by persuasion if possible, but ready also to resort to force where necessary. But, if Christ used strong words about riches, did He not also take an uncompromising stand against force? Yet Mr. Ingram never discusses this —indeed his one reference to it is the curious sentence

> 'I have not mentioned the pacifist alternative, since there is no likelihood of its being adopted' (p. 53).

Canon Lloyd ends his book with a lengthy chapter on *The More Excellent Way*. As a piece of writing, it is not the best part of the book, but the argument is good and valid. The Church's real business is that of Con-

version—and, in the long run, this is the only revolutionary instrument which is really effective. For while, as Canon Lloyd says, 'conversion is plainly the least political and economic form of activity in the world,' yet wherever it is genuine, it must affect both politics and economics. This takes us back to an analogy used by Mr. Ingram. He draws a moral from Reformation days when England, refusing to be either Roman or Protestant, sought a Middle Way—only to find herself 'committed in the end to the Protestant side.' But surely the moral of those days is just the reverse? For, by refusing to embrace either Rome or Geneva, the English Church did follow the middle way—and thereby, has succeeded largely in reforming Catholicism and in educating Protestantism. And that is still the faith of those who believe that between Right and Left, there is a middle way.

J. P. Hodges.

THE JESUS OF HISTORY*

Lives of Jesus abound—Black, White and Red: ecclesiastical, dogmatic, apologetic, sentimental, sceptical and communist. They are read with avidity by those whose pre-suppositions render such literary diet palatable, if not nourishing. Lives of Jesus of this sort have no attraction for those whose supreme question is not: 'What is Trumps, but, What is Truth?'

Among English people, even of the uneducated classes, there are many who 'in a cool hour,' to use Bishop Butler's phrase, are concerned to know the truth about Jesus Christ. The arresting demand of the Hellenists in the Fourth Gospel: 'Sir, we would see Jesus,' means for such seeing the Jesus of History, if it be possible to see him since they are no longer interested in the Jesus of Dogma, whom they believe to be also the Jesus of the Churches which they are deserting.

Mr. Gardner-Smith's *The Christ of the Gospels* is a very valuable contribution in this sphere. The Dean of Jesus College, Cambridge, is a true scholar and combines with his erudition sound judgment and impartial courage. He is in the succession of the great Cambridge New Testament scholars: Westcott, Hort, and Burkitt. How he stands in relation to Professor Dodd can only be adequately dealt with in another connection.

Mr. Gardner-Smith's treatment is not extreme nor is it characterised by startling hypotheses. He stands with Burkitt and Streeter, not with Guignebert and Loisy. He appears to place no reliance on the speculative novelties of the more extreme Form-critics.

> 'Few scholars in this country are prepared to go all the way with Loisy and Guignebert. The more the Gospels are studied the less likely does it appear that they are wholly the product of religious imagination. It is just because the age of their composition was uncritical and

* *The Christ of the Gospels.* A Study of the Gospel Records in the Light of Critical Research. By P. Gardner-Smith, B.D. With a Foreword by F. J. Foakes Jackson, D.D. (Heffer. Cambridge. 8/6 net. 1938.)

credulous, capable for instance of producing the apocryphal Gospels, that we are constrained to pronounce the canonical Gospels to be in the main works of history. They tell a sober story, a story that does not at all resemble the romances of the age. They are true to the circumstances of the time, for, although we have no other account of the life of Jesus, we know enough of the conditions in Palestine in the first century to appreciate the general accuracy of the Gospel picture. Above all, the Gospels combine to present a portrait of Christ which cannot with any probability be ascribed to the imagination of His followers' (p. 240).

On the other hand the traditionalist will not find Mr. Gardner-Smith's conclusions acceptable in a number of important issues. For instance, he writes of St. Luke's account of the Virgin Birth:

'Some critics think that verse 34 (*Luke* i) is merely introduced in order to make possible the declaration of verse 35. It is only the latter verse which contains any suggestion of a virgin birth, and the underlying thought is Greek rather than Jewish. In Jewish thought anyone might be called "a son of God" who was inspired by the divine Spirit: but among the Greeks the term would imply divine instead of human parentage. It is not impossible that behind the Third Gospel there lies an earlier source in which this verse was not contained, but the mere fact that there is some disturbance of the text in these two verses is not sufficient reason for thinking that they are no part of the Gospel as written by St. Luke' (p. 66).

Of the Census which Luke relates brought about the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem, Mr. Gardner-Smith writes:

'It is not to be wondered at that many critics consider the whole story a legend which has grown up to enable Christians to claim that Jesus was born at Bethlehem and that the prophecy of Micah v. 2 had thus been fulfilled. Both the First and Third Gospels show the influence of that prophecy, but whereas Matthew supposes that Joseph and Mary lived in Bethlehem until compelled to flee by the threats of Herod the King, Luke, knowing that Nazareth was their home, relies upon this very questionable tradition to bring the mother of Jesus to Bethlehem at the time of His birth.

'One thing is clear, the accounts of Matthew and Luke cannot be reconciled. Matthew's narrative implies a date hardly later than 6 B.C. for the birth at Bethlehem; Luke, by connecting it with the census, implies a date not earlier than A.D. 6, which on almost every ground is to be rejected. An apparent discrepancy of some twelve years is indeed astonishing in such a matter. If it be allowed that Luke is mistaken about the census, the problem of the date may be relieved, but then all reason for bringing Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem disappears' (p. 68).

Mr. Gardner-Smith concludes:

'These discrepancies between the accounts of the First and Third Gospels are now generally admitted, and the attempt to harmonise them has been abandoned. . . .

'St. Mark, St. Paul, and St. John are witnesses that the early Church did not lay any stress on the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, and if it was not of supreme importance in the first century it is hard to

maintain that it is vital in the twentieth. The idea that the divinity of Christ is somehow bound up with the historicity of the Virgin Birth is perhaps common, but it is none the less childish. When we say that Jesus was Son of God we certainly do not mean Son in a physical sense—that is, that God, and not Joseph, was His father. A literal interpretation of Luke's narrative would make Jesus the Son of the Holy Spirit, by whose operation the Virgin is said to have conceived; and the inevitable inference would be that before the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem, God had no Son—which is profoundly heretical. . . . At no time has the Church taught that Jesus was Son of God because God and not Joseph was His father. . . .

It is not clear, therefore, why it should not be considered fitting for Him to have been born like other men, and so far from theological difficulties being removed by the belief that He was born of a virgin, they are rather increased' (pp. 69-72).

The same learned and judicious method is manifest in Mr. Gardner-Smith's treatment of the Resurrection appearance in the Epilogue of the Fourth Gospel (*John* xxi):

'Whatever may be the date and authorship of this last chapter of the Fourth Gospel, it seems to embody a very early tradition, earlier in fact than some of those which appear in the synoptic Gospels. We have several times referred to the appearance to Peter which St. Paul put first in his list of the evidence of the resurrection. St. Mark evidently knew something about it, but it dropped out of the tradition before the other synoptic writers composed their Gospels, and there is no room for it in the accounts of Luke xxiv. and John xx. Then in this appendix to the latest of the Gospels, and in the apocryphal Gospel of Peter, it reappears in a manner which makes it not altogether impossible to reconstruct the earliest tradition. The disciples, uncheered by any message from the women (who, frightened and perplexed by their experience at the tomb, kept silence as to their adventure), returned to Galilee and went back to their life as fishermen. Before long some of them had a mysterious experience. As they returned from a fishing expedition in the early hours of the morning they saw the figure of Jesus, and Peter jumped from the boat to meet Him. He was restored and given his commission to be a fisher of men and a shepherd of the flock of Christ. In the weeks that followed there were other occasions on which the disciples were conscious of the presence of Jesus, and before long they returned to Jerusalem, finally convinced that He was alive, that He was the Messiah, and that before long He would be manifested in His kingdom. That was why they gathered in the Holy City. To the present writer it seems quite obvious that this was substantially the earliest form of the tradition of the resurrection' (p. 236).

Mr. Gardner-Smith concludes his careful review of the Resurrection evidence with this verdict:

'Whatever opinion may be held concerning details, the evidence is overwhelming that the disciples did see the Lord after His death and burial, and that therefore the faith of the Christian Church is founded on fact. Only let it be noted that the strength of the evidence for the resurrection lies in the testimony of those who saw the risen Lord, and not in the stories of the empty tomb' (p. 237).

Outside the Gospels themselves, the most deservedly popular Life of Jesus is we believe Dr. Glover's *Jesus of History,* but it is not sufficiently critical for many of our younger educated men and women. To these we are unable to commend a better book than *The Christ of the Gospels,* by Mr. Gardner-Smith.

We ought to add that this book contains a characteristic Foreword by that veteran Cambridge scholar, Dr. Foakes Jackson, to whom the Cambridge Faculty of Theology owed so much as a most inspiring and influential tutor.

H.D.A.M.

A RUSSIAN PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION*

In his preface to *God, Man and the Church,* the translator tells us that Solovyef wrote this book in 1882-84, when he was 29-31 years of age. In 1896 he was received into the Roman Catholic Church, four years before his death. Solovyef is interesting as a Russian of the last century who has influenced profoundly all the exponents of modern Russian theology and Christian philosophy, and this book is the clearest and most convenient account of his principles and teaching.

The core of the book lies in Part II ('Christianity'), from which indeed the practical teaching in Part I is derived, and which gives Solovyef's complete philosophy of religion. According to his thought the Christian revelation imposes social duties on us as well as the duties of personal religion; they are imposed in the face of the evil in the world, which is a fact, but to the mind and the imagination an absurdity. This disposes rather neatly of the common argument against fighting certain evils, such as war, on the ground that they always have been. Selfishness is the real evil in mankind, and is a segregating principle; but the facts include also a tendency towards others, and the reality—for Solovyef, the final cause—of existence is claimed to be a oneness. The complete integrality of existence, God, is accordingly the foundation of existence, manifested in all the instinctive mutual movements of creatures towards harmony. But life's true meaning is not exemplified when, as in some religions, the individual is merely swallowed up by the 'all.' True unity is attained when each part wills to unite itself to the whole.

The reflection of this conflict in man

> 'is the contradiction between his idea of universal unity and the blind instinct which urges him (like other animals) to affirm his individual and chance existence at the expense of all other beings.'

If the divine principle which will provide the necessary motive force towards unity is to capture man's life and will the incarnation is a necessary event. Now, the Jews received their revelation of the character of God under the

* *God, Man and the Church.* By Vladimir Solovyef. Translated by Donald Attwater. (James Clarke & Co., Ltd. 1938. 5/-.)

form of personality, and were the first to recognise him as a subject, a subsistent 'I.' This points to their insistence on the subjective element which can be a great good or a great evil. It is a great good when the element of selfishness and wickedness presupposed in every active moral character has been

> 'modified into power in order that the new force of good may develop from power into action. . . . The actual goodness of the saint involves the ability to be evil.'

(This rings true also as an analysis of conversion, whether by that word is understood any sudden change of disposition or that long, perhaps lifelong, process by which the disciple offers his being to God's service.) Further, the union of each with all, the *raison d'être* of the world, regarded as a living personal force, is love. The incarnation gives this necessary power to the world, and thus understood is not alien to the general order of life, but

> 'is radically bound up with the whole history of the world and of mankind as a logically deducible event for which that history was a preparation.'

There follows an ingenious argument to show the necessity for Christ to have two wills (human and divine) although it includes the admission that the first must be subdued to the second. We feel the shadow here of that dualism in Solovyef's philosophy which presently appears and which he does not quite convincingly resolve. Not that he is content with his dualism: if the incarnation is necessary, it follows that the true life of good which must displace the reign of wickedness should be not only ideal but real. The dualism is resolved when mankind is transformed.

> 'The triumphant spiritual principle demonstrates its supremacy by not destroying defeated nature: on the contrary, it renews it and gives it a better form of existence.'

This is accomplished in the resurrection, in which a spiritual body expresses fully the life both of matter and of spirit. When we read this conclusion we must be struck by the apparent completeness of Solovyef's philosophy and by a feeling of regret that it proceeds partly from what would now be regarded as a false premise, namely, that the wickedness inherent in mankind is due to corruption inherent in matter. It is only because we are accustomed to take for granted this falsely evaluating division into matter and spirit of the world of our experience, that we forget that within the terms of 'Fall' theology we must hold that the 'spiritual' part of man lies also bound in wickedness, and needs redemption as much as the 'material,' and indeed that the distinction between the two is at best an occasionally useful working distinction for thought, but should never imply any kind of judgment that the 'spiritual' mode of activity is, *quâ* 'spiritual,' of greater moral value than the 'material' mode. We should then agree with Solovyef that final redemption of creation will make a proper harmony of the 'spiritual' and the 'material,' but add that this harmony is as necessary to 'spirit' as

to ' matter,' and finally that it is the whole nature of mankind which stands in need of redemption. Solovyef did not live to see as clearly as we can the result of religion practised almost exclusively as the ' life of the spirit ' nor of the confusion of thought which springs partly from the false distinction between ' spirit ' and ' matter,' which he fostered and which, for example, has led his translator to condemn Marxist materialism, which is a philosophy of history and a sociology, as though it were merely another form of the ' materialism ' *i.e.* worship of Mammon, of capitalism.

There are moments when Solovyef seems to realise the danger of his dualism, for he speaks of ' a materialization of spirit and spiritualization of matter,' but it is the latter which in the practical parts of his book he almost exclusively preaches.

Such in outline is the philosophy of Solovyef as set forward in Part II of this book. The first part enunciates principles derived from it and we find, as we should expect, a tendency to asceticism of the ' Catholic ' type, and founded on the dualism which he does not resolve to our satisfaction. Part III deals with the Church and contains nothing of particular interest, stating as it does an authoritarian position which foreshadows the author's reception into the Roman Catholic Church.

The translator deserves high praise for the great clarity which he has secured, and for thus making available to English readers a book not only interesting as the work of one who had great influence on contemporary Russian theologians, but as a noble and original exposition of Christianity which is challenging both to thought and to practice.

A. R. C. Leaney.

UNITARIANS IN ACTION *

The Unitarian Movement is a branch of English Puritanism, and is proved so by the practical activity of its members. To Unitarians religion has largely meant conduct. They have set a high standard of public and private duty; they have been great at getting things done. But what is rarer and more valuable in English life, they have been consistently pioneers in political and social reform; they have been cultured, intelligent, progressive, and enthusiastic workers for better education. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries Unitarianism was the Modernism of Nonconformity. It was extremely unpopular. Unitarians held together, because so many were against them. Their societies developed a high regard for bold religious speculation, because they were groups of people who all alike valued free thinking in religion. They applied the same principle of free inquiry to all subjects. This opened their minds to new ideas, and made them reformers in all departments of human life.

* *The Unitarian Contribution to Social Progress in England.* By Raymond V. Holt, M.A., B.Litt. (Allen and Unwin. 10/6. 1938.)
Walking Together. By Anne Holt, M.A., F.R.Hist.S. (Allen and Unwin. 5/-. 1938.)

The Rev. R. V. Holt, Tutor at Manchester College, Oxford, has written a general survey of the work done by Unitarians for social and political reform. This is not so well known as it should be. Individual Unitarians are remembered for their public services, not for their Unitarianism. Joseph Chamberlain's father, when introduced to a stranger, used to say, 'Yes Sir, Joseph Chamberlain, and a Unitarian.' But biographers have often been so ashamed of their subjects' unorthodoxy that they have not mentioned it. This is true of many of the over two hundred biographies of Unitarians in the Dictionary of National Biography.

In the eighteenth century Unitarians or, as they were then mostly, Liberal Dissenters, could not take much part in public life. Political power was in the hands of the aristocracy, and the Test and Corporation Acts excluded Dissenters from local government. But towards the end of the century they were pioneers for Parliamentary reform, Price and Priestley being specially active. During the reaction in England which followed the French Revolution many suffered much. Priestley and his friends had their houses burnt by the Birmingham mob, and for some years Unitarians up and down the country were unjustly treated by Tory judges and magistrates.

Unitarians were prominent in the movement for the abolition of the Slave Trade; this was specially noticeable in the principal English slave-trading port of Liverpool, where before the agitation several Unitarians had been slave-traders. They also played a leading part in the Industrial Revolution; for many of the most successful manufacturers using the new machinery were Unitarians. Here they were divided in policy. Unitarians did not say like many Evangelicals and Methodists that the Government should do nothing to relieve the misery of the working classes, because their distress was due to human wickedness. They believed in man and in human perfectibility; their ideals were those of the French Revolution. But many opposed Government control as contrary to economic theory and the prevailing doctrine of laissez-faire. However, Unitarian manufacturers were often good employers, like the Gregs at Styal and the Ashtons at Hyde; Fielden, a large mill owner at Todmorden, was one of the keenest workers for the Factory Acts.

Mr. Holt's record of Unitarian work for all sorts of reform is impressive, since Unitarianism has never been a popular movement. But his book has not been easy to write and in places it is scrappy; for his subject has been not the centre but the circumference of the movement; he has described the varied work of Unitarians, but he has not said much about the sources of its inspiration. Miss Holt in *Walking Together* does something to supply the deficiency, by telling the story of the notable Unitarian congregation now worshipping in Ullet Road Church, Liverpool. To understand the spirit, past and present, of a religious society is difficult, especially if it be Unitarian, since Unitarians have moved and rebuilt their chapels so often,

sweeping away most of the old landmarks. The Ullet Road Congregation has in the course of 250 years worshipped in four different buildings. Its history is important, for many of Liverpool's leading citizens have belonged to it. Miss Holt has made careful researches and she tells her story clearly. But till the end of the eighteenth century the picture she draws is dim, and some of her pages are dull with too much detail.

Most of those who worshipped in the Castle Hey and Benn's Garden Chapels have been long since forgotten, so that only diaries and old letters could make them live for us again. But one can recapture the spirit of the congregation from the descriptions of two ministries exercised in the Renshaw Street Chapel: the Rev. J. H. Thom's, 1831—1866, and the Rev. C. Beard's 1866—1888. Thom was a man of great spiritual power and earnestness. One member of his congregation found that 'he was seldom able to listen to the whole of a Sunday's discourse. By the time it was halfway over his mind had travelled away on the track of the thoughts and purposes it had introduced, and was grappling with the unsuspected obligations which had been revealed.' Another left the Chapel 'because the morality taught by Mr. Thom was impracticably high.' Thom wished 'to see every member of the church engaged in some work on its behalf.' There was Hospital Sunday in Renshaw Street Chapel ten years before it was adopted in other Liverpool Churches. Thom also started a Domestic Mission to the people in the poor streets near the Chapel. Beard was of a different type. He was a scholar, and his book on the Reformation, published in 1870 and recently reprinted, is still the best of its kind on the subject. He was also a public figure, the inspirer of the founders of University College, afterwards Liverpool University. Besides being a public man and an author, Beard was a fine preacher and a man of spiritual experience. 'I do not understand how men continue to pray unless they are convinced that there is a listening ear,' he wrote. The ministries of Thom and Beard show what Unitarianism at its best can be. They help to explain how in the course of 200 years Unitarians, though few in numbers, have been able to make a valuable contribution to English life.

J. K. Nettlefold.

THE CLOISTER AND THE COLLEGE*

The Benedictine monastery was the means of bringing classical and Christian culture 'from the far-off hills of time to the humming and crowded cities of modern civilization.' Such is the well-known claim made in Hodgkin's *Italy and her Invaders,* to which the writer of the present volume refers and which he does much to make good in his particular treatment of the subject. Apart from the attractions of the monastic life to the mediaeval

* *Saint Benedict.* By Dom Justin McCann. (Sheed and Ward. 7/6 net. 1938.)
The Mediaeval Universities. By Nathan Schachner. (George Allen and Unwin. 12/6 net. 1938.)

man, the secret of Benedictine progress lay in the compilation of Benedict's 'rule' for his monks. Francis Bacon has the remark that 'the acting upon somewhat conceived in writing facilitates despatch.' Nothing more aptly accounts for the early stages and subsequent expansion of the order of Black monks, who, living by the 'regula,' became pioneers of religion and the arts of civilization in every part of Europe. Every student is familiar with what was done for religion in the discipline and daily services, for learning in the monastic *scriptorium,* for the science of agriculture in the fields about the monastery. In regard to the saintly founder of the order, however, only meagre and legendary evidence exists. The famous *Rule* and the *Dialogues of St. Gregory* are almost the sole sources. The value of the *Dialogues* is very debatable. They present a portrait of the saint as an exponent of miracles almost from childhood. Then again, what caused Benedict, after one or two monastic experiments, to select the lofty eminence of Monte Cassino? We cannot say. Dom McCann cites the mediaeval lines :

> Bernard loved the valleys ; Benedict the mountains ;
> Francis the towns, and Dominic celebrated cities.

There may be as much reason here for the beginnings of the greatest Benedictine monastery as in any other good conjecture. We have before us the story of the saint and his order told from the Catholic standpoint. Dom McCann has an excellent chapter on 'Benedictinism.' It is a fact that the mists of time have hidden the man, but the history of his order is the saint's lengthened shadow. For our own country the Benedictines did two notable things. Augustine introduced the order into Britain. From the northern cloisters of this learned order the monk-scholar Bede bequeathed to us the opening chapters of early English Church history.

While every Benedictine monastery was a centre of culture, it is important to bear in mind that the education which the mediaeval monk made use of was gained elsewhere than in the cloisters. The Benedictines and other religious orders set up special places of study for their members. These seminaries formed one element in the origin of the college within a university. At Oxford, for instance, some of these mediaeval monastic halls of study may be seen at Worcester College, into which they became incorporated. The story of the mediaeval universities and the growth of the college system from the 'hall' founded by a monastery or some other corporate body, is described by Nathan Schachner in *The Mediaeval Universities,* in a spirited style that does justice to the conflicts and emotions of the period, and at the same time presents a fascinating picture of mediaeval student life and customs.

> 'When we try to visualize a university of the Middle Ages, it is not Salerno that the inner eye comes to rest upon, nor even Bologna, influential as she was, nor Oxford, the pride of England ; it is Paris, the great overshadowing university on the banks of the Seine, whither all roads led ; the intellectual centre of Europe, the theological arbiter

> of the world; the very seat and repository of philosophy, the slavishly imitated progenitor of all northern universities; . . . the streets of its Quartier filled with riotous. surging students, plangent with street cries, colourful with magnificent rectors and dazzling processions, a city within a city, a state within a state, a nation within a nation, with its own laws, government, customs, privileges, and immunities. No education was complete without a sojourn in Paris . . . ' (p. 56).

At Paris the residental hall of students under a master began, which grew into the self-governing college within the university with which we in England are well acquainted. The main concerns of what may be called the university movement had to do with the assertion by the university of its independence from the Church, and the development by the college of its freedom in the larger university corporation. The course of events included constant clashes between students of diverse nationality and the local people of the university town before what amounted to a new social class could establish itself.

Dean Rashdall's masterpiece of research is the work upon which Mr. Schachner has naturally relied. A wide interest in the literature, however, has enabled him to produce a well-informed compendium in which he gives both the history and a good deal of the atmosphere of the mediaeval university. We listen to those disputations which, lasting through a weary day, were the precursors of the degree examination of to-day. We see the town mob of Oxford bent upon getting the better of the hated gownsmen. We go behind the scenes where mediaeval medicine, ' a strange hotch-potch of learning and nonsense,' was confidently dispensed until Molière burlesqued it into sense. And as we pass through the streets of Salamanca or Toulouse we hear the songs of the wandering scholars, the Goliards, whose lyrics and student-songs, roisterous, rollicking, and amorous, were inseparably associated with the everyday life of the Middle Ages. In convenient form the author has provided a volume which can be read with pleasure as a general survey or as an introduction to special study.

J. R. McCallum.

CONCERNING HYMNS*

When one reflects that hymn-singing is as old as Christianity itself, and that even to-day in the popular mind no Church service is complete without at least three hymns, the dearth of modern books on hymnody is a little surprising. As a sheer storehouse of information Julian's great *Dictionary of Hymnology* (1892) still stands unrivalled; but no dictionary was ever meant to be read: Frere's *Historical Edition of Hymns Ancient and Modern* (1909), though instinct with the learning which always characterised its author, is (apart from the slender introduction) no more than a series of notes on certain selected hymns: while the most recent

* *Hymnody: Past and Present.* By C. H. Phillips, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 1937. pp. x + 300. 7/6 net.)

addition to the literature of the subject in English, Dearmer's *Songs of Praise Discussed* (1933), suffers from exactly the same disadvantages—excellent as it is within its limits, it is again a dictionary, and a dictionary which is necessarily confined in its purview to the contents of a single collection. Otherwise there are monographs on the hymns of particular periods, churches, and peoples; but these are almost entirely specialist works, either inaccessable or unpalatable to the general reader. Yet it is just for this type of reader that Dr. Phillips caters.

The Introduction (Concerning Hymns in General) describes the scope. There is an essential distinction, Dr. Phillips maintains, between a hymn and a religious poem, although the two are often confused. Two principles, derived in the first instance from the hymnographer John Newton, make this clear. A hymn in order to be a hymn, and not merely a religious poem must be (*a*) 'designed for public worship,' and (*b*) 'designed for the use of plain people.' But for such 'plain people' to form a judgment upon the hymns that they use in public worship, and upon which they so freely express themselves, a basis of knowledge is necessary—'knowledge, first, of the history and range of Christian hymnody and, secondly, of the criteria that should be applied to judging individual hymns' (p. 7).

Part I (pp.11-245) is accordingly historical and traces the development of the hymn from the days of St. Paul to our own. 'With great learning, which (as the dust-cover assures the prospective reader) is always carried lightly,' the hymns of the Early, Eastern, and Latin churches are passed in review: and here the author rightly stresses not only the debt which the Church owes to the Synagogue in this respect, but also the 'objectiveness' of Greek hymnody, which provides a welcome contrast to the 'subjective' tendency of so many more recent specimens, concentrating, as they do, 'on the moods and needs of the human ego rather than on the splendour and beauty of God and of his revelation in Christ' (p. 46). Then follow chapters on German Hymnody, the Metrical Psalters, English Hymnody up to the time of Watts, and on the contributions of the Methodists and Evangelicals, the Oxford Movement, and the Twentieth Century.

Throughout Part I the standard is high, though the chapter on German Hymnody falls considerably below the rest. The dust-cover describes it as a 'glance'; Dr. Phillips himself pleads lack of space, and then, almost repenting of his initial excuse, takes shelter behind Robert Bridges' dictum that 'attempts to introduce the German chorales into England have never . . . been successful,' adding on his own account that 'without their tunes the words are for the most part devoid of any great claim to attention' (p. 101). This maybe, but I suspect (from a study of the work as a whole) that the real reason is that the author's knowledge of German is not equal to his knowledge of French—perhaps excusable to the historian of the Church in France! In any case, this chapter remains the weakest spot in the book. For the rest, Dr. Phillips seems to accept just a little too easily (though it is only in passing) both the 'backwoods' theory of the origin of

the Didache (p. 16), and (curiously enough) the 'Harnackian' viewpoint of the development of the Christian Ministry (p. 17); while on p. 219 is not the *Bible* commentary attributed to Dean Alford, a slip for *Greek Testament?*—Alford's *Old* Testament Commentary never got beyond Exodus XXV.

On p. 157, l. 33 an 'f' has dropped out: this is the only printer's error I have noticed.

Part II (Practical—pp. 249-269) consists of two chapters entitled 'Towards a Policy' and 'Some Practical Counsels.' This last includes an excellent note on Congregational Hymn Practices by Dr. S. H. Nicholson, and the whole is characterised by sound commonsense as a few extracts will show. Of 'Victorian' and 'Georgian' hymns:—

> 'the characteristic products of Victorian hymnody are probably neither as good as the Victorians thought them nor as bad as their critics of to-day think them. Time will winnow them out, as it has winnowed out the hymns of earlier ages. . . . The inferior specimens among the 'Georgian' hymns now being produced are likely to be just as much a nuisance to the musical reformers of fifty years hence as the bad 'Victorian' hymns are to those of to-day' (p. 255).

Of the choice of hymns:—

> 'The present movement in favour of 'stark' and 'rugged' hymns proceeds from a cultivated artistic circle which is rather out of touch with the workaday world of the common man. The ordinary Englishman is decidely a Philistine . . . and if when he goes to church he prefers hymns like 'Abide with me' or 'Hark, hark my soul' to German chorales or a combination of Bridges and Bourgeois, we must not refuse him a measure of what he likes. . . . A church, after all, is a place to help the wayfaring man or woman along the rough road of life, not an academy of the fine arts' (p. 254).

Of Saints' Days' Hymns:—

> 'We do not really need hymns about such shadowy figures as St. Bartholomew or St. Simon and St. Jude, which even the most accomplished poet could hardly hope to make very inspiring' (p. 250).

Of children's hymns:—

> 'Even "children's hymns" should be to some extent "graded," just as the children themselves are graded. All children's hymns are not equally suitable for all children. It is unkind to ask big boys and girls of fourteen to describe themselves as "little children"' (p. 267).

Of the authorisation of an 'official' hymn-book by the Church of England:—

> 'Such a book would be difficult to compile, more difficult to enforce in general use, and most difficult of all to change when once it was compiled and adopted. Yet there can be no life without change: and the Church must be ready to march with the times, in its hymnody as in other more important matters' (p. 259).

The book concludes with four Appendices on Hymn Metres, the Development of the Hymnal Scheme of the English Mediaeval Breviaries, Office Hymns from the 'Neo-Gallican' Breviaries appearing in English versions,

and English Hymns in common use based on the Psalms. These together form Part III.

It is a pity that the foot-notes have been thought so 'distracting' (p. vii) as to be relegated to the end of the volume!

Those whose main interest in hymns is musical rather than literary or liturgical must necessarily be a trifle disappointed with this work: but of its solid and lasting merit there can be no doubt. Imbued with the ideals and aims of the School of English Church Music, it is a production of which both the author, and the College of St. Nicholas, Chislehurst (where he is Chaplain), may be justly proud.

HEDLEY F. D. SPARKS.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

THE BLACK INTERNATIONAL.

SIR,

In his article, 'The Black International,' in your July issue, Mr. Hardwick cites a text of Sheikh Si-Snoussi's *Book of Duties*, which appears to him, as to Mr. Ridley from whose book, *The Jesuit*, he took it, evidence that Ignatius Loyola fashioned his Society on the model of the 'Mohammedan rather than the Christian Monastic orders.' For the sake of accuracy, may I point out that Si-Snoussi died just a little more than three centuries *after* Loyola — Loyola in 1556 and Si-Snoussi in 1859. The rest of the evidence produced by Mr. Ridley is on the same diverting level. As for the corpse metaphor, it is obvious and can be found in the writings of the fourth century St. Basil and the thirteenth century St. Bonaventure. Ignatius had no need to go to Africa or Arabia for it.

J. BRODRICK, S.J.

114 Mount Street,
Grosvenor Square,
London, W.

Mr. HARDWICK'S REPLY.

SIR,

In mathematics, if two points through which a curve passes are given, it is possible to construct the rest of the curve. Mr. Ridley in his book, and I in my article, supplied two points in the curve of the development of Islamic sects: (1) the 'Assassins' — an order which lasted from the time of its founder, Hasan-Ben-Sabah, in the eleventh century, until its liquidation by the Tartars and Mamelukes in the thirteenth; and (2) the Senussi, founded in the eighteenth century. The founder of the latter order (whose date Fr. Brodrick gives correctly) bade his disciples remain faithful to the traditions of Islam — thus in his doctrine of 'corpse-like obedience' he did not regard himself as an innovator. The tradition of such obedience may be concluded to have survived from the days of 'The Old Man of the Mountain — the 'General' of the Assassins, down to the days of Si-Snoussi. Thus I think Mr. Ridley's argument holds, and Fr. Brodrick's point about Si-Snoussi's date is only a verbal one.

However, I ventured to refer the matter to M. Ridley himself, who has been kind enough to supply me with the following notes:—

(1) The three Dervishes quoted by name by Müller — reproduced by me, pp. 211, 212 — were all post-Agnatian. Their dates were, respectively: Si-Snoussi, 1791—1859; Mouley Ali-el-Djemal, 1674—1779; founder of the Ralmania sect, 1715—1794.

(2) In spite of this fact it will be evident from what follows that Fr. Brodrick's criticism is a verbal quibble only. *e.g.* all the Dervish Orders mentioned by Müller, *viz.* Senussi, Derquoua, Ralmania, were offshoots of older orders whose traditional language they would by Dervish custom be bound to repeat. The Senussi derive from Khadima founded in 1713. I may add that Si-Snoussi when on his death-bed bade his disciples always remain faithful to the old traditions of Islam. A founder of a revivalist sect such as the Senussi would in any case be unlikely to depart in his language from traditional models. The other two orders, *viz.* Derquoua and Ralmania derive, respectively, from the mediaeval (pre-Ignatian) orders of Chadelya, founded in 1196, and Khelouatia, founded in 1397. Their fraternal language must therefore have been pre-Ignatian.

(3) Thus it will be seen that two of Müller's three orders, cited by myself as sources of Jesuitism, were pre-Ignatian in origin, and the third, Senussi, was a conscious return to Islamic mediaevalism, itself derived from an eighteenth century North African order, which had virtually no contact with any of the Jesuit centres of activity.

I may add that Müller's selection of post-Ignatian African Dervish models was no doubt due to the fact that their careers and writings are much better known to Europeans than are those of their earlier Oriental confrères. This is due to the interest taken in their quasi-political activities by the French colonial government, which has employed Islamic experts to study them in detail. Hence the modern examples given.

Mr. Ridley, in a footnote on p. 204 of his book, points out that borrowings from Islam by Christianity were no new thing, nor was there anything disgraceful about them. The Crusades are adaptations of the Jihad, or Holy War; and a learned Spanish Jesuit, Fr. Asin y Palacios, in a book published a few years ago, proves from overwhelming internal evidence that Dante borrowed wholesale, and without acknowledgment, from the Arabs. Aquinas, too, was heavily indebted to the Arabs in constructing his system of theology.

With regard to Fr. Brodrick's remark about the 'corpse metaphor,' Mr. Ridley adds the following note:

(4) Re 'Perinde ac Cadaver.' Doubtless similar expressions can be found in the monastic literature ascribed to SS. Basil, Bonaventure, etc. I was not concerned with incidental resemblances, but with a derivation in detail. Were the main and distinctively original features of the Jesuit Company derived from earlier Christian Orders, or from Islam? I suggest that a detailed comparison of (i) The Greek monks of St. Basil; (ii) The Franciscans; (iii) The Dervishes; (iv) The Jesuits, leaves no reasonable doubt as to the correct answer.

J. C. HARDWICK.

LECTIONARY OF POST-BIBLICAL PROSE.

SIR,

I am glad to be able to make a favourable report on the progress of support for the *Lectionary of Post-Biblical Prose*.

The Loughborough Conference produced a large crop of subscriptions, and a few have come in since then. I give acknowledgements of all these below.

We are now hard at work at Westcott House putting the final touches to the MS. of the book.

It will be seen that we now have the £100 subsidy complete, and some £28 in addition towards the £50 estimated to be required for the reserve fund for payment of permission fees. I shall be very glad and grateful if the balance of £22 can be subscribed at as early a date as possible, in order that Messrs. Longmans may feel free to get on with publication.

I should like to thank most warmly all those who have helped in the production of this work, whether by subscriptions, suggestions, or by helping to copy passages.

A. C. BOUQUET.

Gilling House,
Madingley Road, Cambridge.
October 13th, 1938.

SECOND LIST OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

The Rev. W. N. Oldaker, £1 1*s*. 0*d*.; the Rev. G. Molesworth, £1 1*s*. 0*d*.; Sir Francis Fremantle, M.P., £1 1*s*. 0*d*.; Mrs. Wilkinson, 10*s*.; Miss W. M. Fayerman, £2 2*s*. 0*d*.; C. B. Russell, Esq., £2 0*s*. 0*d*.; the Rev. F. Moyle, £2 0*s*. 0*d*.; W. Fairlie-Clarke, Esq., £1 0*s*. 0*d*.; the Rev. F. S. Horan, £1 1*s*. 0*d*.; Miss H. M. Virtue-Tebbs, £5 0*s*. 0*d*.; H. Fitzmaurice, Esq., £1 1*s*. 0*d*.; Anonymous, 10*s*.; Anonymous, 10*s*.; Mrs. M. Brock, 5*s*.; Miss Willis, £2 2*s*. 0*d*.; H. M. S. Plumptre, Esq., £1 0*s*. 0*d*.; the Rev. J. S. Boys-Smith, £1 0*s*. 0*d*.; the Rev. A. H. M. Kempe, 2*s*. 6*d*.; the Rev. P. Kingdon, 10*s*.; the Rev. M. T. Dunlop, £1 0*s*. 0*d*.; the Rev. H. C. Alexander, 10*s*. 6*d*.; the Rev. R. G. Bury, £5 0*s*. 0*d*.; the Rev. H. D. A. Major (2nd donation), £5 0*s*. 0*d*.; the Rev. Dr. J. F. Bethune-Baker (2nd donation), £3 0*s*. 0*d*.; Collection at Loughborough Conference, £3 10*s*. 8*d*.; the Rev. Geoffrey Allen, £10 0*s*. 0*d*.; Council of the M.C.U., £10 10*s*. 0*d*.; the Rev. L. P. Smith, £1 0*s*. 0*d*.; Sir Francis Fremantle (2nd donation), £1 1*s*. 0*d*.

A MODERN CRUSADE.

SIR,

At the modern Churchmen's Conference held last week at Loughborough, two special meetings were held to consider how best to implement the courageous call first made in Mr. Horan's article, 'A Modern Crusade.'

All who were present must have been impressed by the eager response elicited. The thought and feeling of the company seemed to turn especially to works of charity as a means of commending the Modernist cause to thinking men of goodwill.

One speaker, however, made an observation so important that I beg to be allowed to underline it.

Speaking of those who share our concern at the chaos of modern life, without sharing the fellowship of any church, he said: 'They do not want charity.'

This is profoundly true.

Charity appears merely as hypocrisy when men think that we are not trying to remove the sources of the evils we offer to alleviate. On the other hand a proven sincerity has maximum propaganda value.

The Christian Church, now largely discredited in this Christian country, exists to provide that teaching and society without which men do not see God. But men outside the churches observe our defects and anti-social actions more than our excellencies.

My friends of the Labour Party are constantly reminding me of unchristian aspects of the Church of England, but they are not hostile to religion as such.

The time may be not far distant when a Party will be in power which will ask proof of social worth from those who wish to retain special powers and resources; a Party with a less sophisticated way of thought than the older political parties, but able to discern, and willing to help truth and single-minded service.

Can the Churches, Established and Free, produce in time a comprehensive reformation of organised Christianity in England? Some form of co-establishment, an intelligible idiom, an acceptable form of patronage, a just distribution of income, a Christian regard for the sources of that income, a greatly heightened ideal of Christian integrity, an immeasurably widened conception of religious life?

Such a reformation demands the collation of masses of material; a deal of thought, discussion, knowledge; the making of a plan, a programme; a campaign of publicity throughout the local Councils of the Churches.

I wish that Modernists might initiate it in the Church of England and that the urgent need for it might be remembered wherever Modernists ask themselves, 'What can we do?'

HILDA HUBBARD.

King's Bridge,
Steeple Claydon, Bletchley.
September 16th, 1938.

A NOTE FOR PRAYER BOOK REVISION.

SIR,

In these days when psychologists and others are teaching us so much about the power of the spoken word to impress the subconsciousness and the value of 'affirmations' to our health and well-being, physical, mental and spiritual, can we be doing right in going to church and joining in services that consist largely in 'beseeching' an apparently reluctant God to 'have mercy upon us'?

For my part, whenever I am present in a church when the Litany is read, I transpose the responses as follows: 'Thou, Lord, deliverest'; 'Thou sparest, good Lord' and 'We believe Thou dost hear us, good Lord.' I also find it helpful to make changes of a similar nature in other parts of our Church Services. For instance, in the Communion Service, where, in the

Prayer for the Church militant, the expression 'beseech' occurs four times, I mentally substitute 'trust,' 'look to' or 'depend upon.' Also in the Prayer of Humble Access, after admitting unworthiness and citing the instance of our Lord's goodness to the Syro-Phoenician woman, I insert 'Thou dost' before 'Grant us, therefore.'

It seems to me to be the duty of all Modernists to do what they can to get such vital changes as these made in our Prayer Book, whatever else is or is not altered.

ROSA C. VINE.

Edge House,
Nr. Stroud, Glos.

BIBLICAL BOOKLETS BY MODERN SCHOLARS.

SIR,

The Doctrinal Report having given Modernism recognition, we can devote ourselves the more freely to the wide dissemination of the results of assured scholarship which have in the past been too often restricted to technical and costly books.

The Council has arranged with Messrs. Thomas Murby & Co. (1 Fleet Lane, Ludgate Circus, E.C.4) for the publication of sixpenny books about the Bible in the light of modern scholarship, under the general title of *After Four Hundred Years*. Our President and Chairman, together with Dr. Coulton, Professor Hooke, the Rev. Dr. Levertoff and the Rev. J. C. Hardwick have kindly contributed to the series, which is popular in style and also cheap in price. A further set of books for the series will be brought out early next year.

May I, as editor, appeal to your readers to help the purpose of the Council by asking for and ordering the books from their local booksellers and especially from station bookstalls, rather than from the office of the Union. For this will help to acquaint the general public with the kind of literature which we have to offer and will enable it to read the books, for example, on a railway journey. The publishers will send prospectuses on application and offer special terms for those with church bookstalls and similar facilities for exhibiting the series.

Experience shows that popular literature is the best means we have of carrying into effect the evangelistic work of the Union. Those who discussed this side of our activities at Loughborough are surely right in regarding Modernist principles as a divine trust which should be shared rather than as the personal choice of a few.

R. GLADSTONE GRIFFITH.

Farnborough, Kent.
October, 1938.